CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1936. Vol. XXVI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Dogmatism and the Decay of Beliefs.

The *Church Times* of November 13th, 1936, in an editorial entitled 'The Decay of Belief,' deplores that the Christian Faith is weakening in this country.

> 'When the history of "English Thought in the Twentieth Century" comes to be written, a principal chapter will doubtless deal with the decay of belief in these post-war (or should we say inter-war?) years. This decay is the most alarming feature of English society to-day.'

Religious agnosticism is

> 'the death-watch beetle which has sapped the strength of the whole building, and the way to rehabilitate national standards lies in a recovery of religious belief . . . Every Sunday the clergy offer in God's name redemption from sin and death and suffering, and their words fall unheeded . . . Why is this so and what is the remedy? . . . Parents, in particular, have a duty to their children to see that they are brought up not simply in a vague religiosity, but with clear dogmatic beliefs. It was because the Victorian parent, for all his faults, accepted this duty that the Victorian era stands out in comparison with our own as a Golden Age . . .'

We supplement these quotations from the *Church Times* by extracts from the recent speech of Professor Hugh Mackenzie on his retirement from the chair of English language and literature in the University of New Zealand.

> 'The great universities of the Empire and of all the more enlightened countries of the world are now frankly and fearlessly modernist and futurist in all their activities and outlook . . .

> 'The modern university is strictly anti-irrationalist in spirit and intention — I shall not say "rationalist," for that term is used, in certain quarters, as a brickbat instead of argument.
>
> 'Whether we . . . like it or not, the modernists and futurists have already captured our universities and have securely established themselves in most of our professorial chairs: and we old identities of the discredited or superseded old *régime* can but tamely acquiesce or impotently protest. One thing is obvious and that is that a new secular Renaissance and a new ethical and religious reformation are overdue, for it would appear that the old world's religions and philosophies are to-day discredited, or, at any rate, ineffectual in their influence for good . . .
>
> 'Let us hope that the modernised and futurist universities will succeed in formulating a new and stable international ethic that will command the assent of all nations and acquire the status and sanctity of a universal religion and so save civilisation . . .'

The academic verdict from the Antipodes is in agreement with that of the *Church Times*. The Christian traditional dogmatic faith is becoming increasingly discredited in the minds of many, yet the need of the Christian moral and spiritual values, so far as human welfare is concerned, was never greater than it is to-day. The *Church Times* seems to think that the situation can be saved by more insistent and authoritative dogmatic teaching of the young provided that judicious use can be made of the assured results of modern Biblical criticism and modern science. We are convinced that a more radical remedy is needed.

Archbishop Frederick Temple pointed out years ago that the dogmatic method in teaching religion must be exchanged for the psychological. It must be recognized frankly and courageously that the theological situation to-day is one of probabilities rather than certainties; of working hypotheses, rather than doctrinal infallibilities. The proof of the truth of the Christian religion is to be found in a verifiable experience rather than in a logical demonstration or in historical evidence. Furthermore, the effective Christian teacher to-day has to do fearlessly what our Church authorities have not yet done officially, and that is admit that there is a large amount of error in our traditional Christian dogma which not only needs to be, but ought to be, disavowed and jettisoned both in the interests of morality and in the interests of spiritual religion.

The retention of these errors, the product, in many cases, of outworn ways of thinking and feeling, not only repels modern educated people but actually prevents the Christian teacher

himself from formulating and presenting Christian truth in an attractive and convincing manner. But besides the retention of an outworn method and of ancient error, there is the further disadvantage which ensues from the retention of traditional phraseology. St. Vincent of Lerins provides the modern Christian teacher with an admirable motto — *non nova, sed nove*, not new truth but in a new manner.

The best sermon we have ever heard on the Atonement did not mention the word itself nor made use of any of the conventional scriptural phraseology associated with it. By examples drawn from modern life it demonstrated the power of self-sacrificing love to redeem human character.

To-day citations of scriptural passages fall on deaf ears and irresponsive minds, because not only is the phraseology of those citations out-of-date but they are themselves the expression of ways of thinking and feeling which in some cases are incomprehensible and in other cases incredible. It is quite true that clergymen repeat them from Sunday to Sunday in the services of the Church and without producing moral and spiritual results. This surprises and depresses the Traditionalist, but it does not surprise the Modernist. The form in which our traditional dogmas are cast and the error which that form includes, often makes it impossible for the underlying and essential truth of the dogma to be imparted. The task of separating truth from error in our traditional dogmas and the reformulation of those dogmas in our services and formularies is an urgent necessity which we hope the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine will shortly accomplish.

Mr. Basil de Selincourt has said:

> 'There never was a time . . . when faith consisted in believing the unbelievable. The churches at present expect it, and cannot hope to recover vitality till the expectation is outgrown.'

The Christian Church has unfortunately identified Christian faith with the acceptance of a number of ecclesiastical dogmas; yet these are not identical as Keyserling, in his book, *The Recovery of Truth*, has pointed out:

> 'Christianity as most deeply understood would seem destined to maintain its vitality until the end of time, as the symbol of eternal truth even if nobody were to believe any longer in its actual dogmas' (p. 596).

> 'Christ's words have moved the world, not because of the later theologies, but in spite of them' (p. 292).

The Christian teacher to-day has got to learn the hard lesson contained in Dr. Swete's aphorism — The lure of primitiveness may prove no less deceptive than the lure of mediaevalism.

There is certainly much need for Christian teaching united to modern science and modern historical criticism, but we doubt the value of giving this Christian teaching in a dogmatic form to young people who have received a modern education. Dean Inge has said that religion is caught, not taught. It is the association with really Christian people, life in a Christian home, a judicious use of the public institutions of religion — if those institutions be enlightened and inspiring — which are more potent in promoting the Christian religion in this country than the clearest dogmatic teaching of Christian apologists.

Dogmatism is at a discount in the sphere of religion to-day with educated people because, as a matter of fact, it is at a discount in education. Sir Thomas Browne speaks of 'thoughts that do tenderly touch,' but these thoughts do not come to us in dogmatic form forced upon us by irrefragible logic. They come to us rather in the utterances of our prophets, poets and publicists, and not a few of them are transmitted by the B.B.C.

The English Parson.

The Archbishops of Canterbury and York have appointed a Commission 'to consider problems connected with the selection, testing, and training both before and after ordination of those who are called to serve in the sacred ministry of the Church.' The following have consented to be members of the Commission :—The Dean of Christ Church (chairman), the Bishops of Bradford, Bristol, Chester, Derby, Manchester, Portsmouth, and Truro, the Headmaster of Winchester (Mr. S. Leeson), the Headmaster of Malvern (Mr. F. S. Preston), Sir Montague Barlow, Dr. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge (Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield University), Mr. J. Maud (Dean of University College, Oxford), the Archdeacons of Auckland, Halifax and Northumberland, Canon Homes Dudden, D.D. (Master of Pembroke College, Oxford), Canon C. E. Raven, D.D. (Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge), the Rev. Norman

Sykes, Ph.D (Professor of History, London University), the Rev. C. M. Chavasse (Master of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford), the Rev. C. Eastaugh (Kennington), Canon W. Thompson Elliott (vicar of Leeds), the Rev. W. D. L. Greer (secretary, Student Christian Movement), the Rev. A. G. Hebert (Tutor, Kelham Theological College), the Rev. J. M. Hewitt (vicar of Islington), Canon Sir Edwyn Hoskyns (Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge), Canon F. H. B. Ottley (Tait Missioner in the Diocese of Canterbury), and Canon H. C. Robins (vicar of Portsea).

No doubt the aim of the commission is to enable the Church to secure better clergy. If by better clergy is meant clergymen possessed of wider culture, greater gifts of eloquence, and higher educational qualifications: clergymen who are more active, more unselfish, more personally attractive than are some of our present clergy, there will be general agreement. Vicars in making application for curates invariably demand, in the case of the curate to be employed, more gifts and graces than the vicars themselves possess. But this general agreement for the improvement in the personal qualifications of the clergy is united to other demands in which agreement is lacking. Some desire pre-eminently that the clergy should be thoroughly well-trained priests, expert not only in the ritual and ceremonial of the public offices of the Church, but not less expert in their office of hearing Confession and granting Absolution — able to train their parishioners to be good Catholics with a full appreciation of the history, symbolism and proper use of Church institutions and ordinances.

Others desire pre-eminently that their clergy should be converted men who not only know what conversion has meant and means in their own case, but who are also resolved to produce a similar spiritual experience in the case of their parishioners and that chiefly by means of direct and fervent evangelical preaching, teaching, and personal solicitation.

Others again, and they are the vast majority of Churchmen, definitely do not want as their clergyman either a Catholic priest or an evangelical preacher. They would find it very hard to coin the designation by which to describe the clergy they desire. We remember an occasion when the rustic churchwardens of a col-

lege living, interviewing the Head of the College about the appointment of a new vicar, explained to him that what they desired was not a 'papist' but a 'College gentleman.' The ideal of these simple people would seem to have been inherited from a period before the Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic Movements had arisen 'in the troublesome history of the Church of England' as Mr. Augustine Birrell once described it.

There are a large number of English church folk both at home and beyond the seas who still have some such ideal for their clergy. It is not easy to analyse the constituent elements in this clerical ideal, but it would appear that they desire to have the Christian character in him united to the best kind of English culture. They do not want him to be simply a layman in a clerical collar, nor on the other hand a 'Professional Christian,' but a 'padre' with the manners and feelings of the best kind of layman—the good neighbour, the good sportsman, the man who is always ready to take his part in a serious solid way in local movements for the general welfare. One on whose good sense, courtesy and kindness they can always rely, especially in matters of personal difficulty.

When we contemplate this kind of clergyman we wonder whether, like the poet, he is born, not made. He is the product of a certain kind of home and environment: a certain kind of English culture which the vulgarization and modernization of English life would seem to be abolishing to the immeasurable loss of English civilization. The unknown writer of the *ad Diognetum* (one of the earliest and noblest defences of the Christian religion addressed to the pagan world) describes the Christians of his day in phrases, some of which might serve as a picture of the kind of clergy the English people desire to see multiplied:

> 'Christians are not distinguished from the rest of mankind either in locality or in speech or in customs . . . '

They do not

> 'practise any extraordinary kind of life . . . they bear their share in all things as citizens . . . They marry like other men and they beget children . . . They find themselves in the flesh and yet they live not after the flesh. Their existence is on earth, but their citizenship is in heaven. They obey the established laws and they surpass the laws in their own lives. They love all men . . . In a word, what the soul is in a body, this the Christians are in the world.'

It will be maintained that the third ideal of the desirable clergyman is not exclusive of the other two ideals. This would be so if in practice the first and the second were strictly subordinated to the third, but such tends to be the exception rather than the rule. We are, however, convinced that it is only the third type for which the great mass of English people have any use. If this be so, it means that the English people are not going to support, in the long run, any other kind of clergy.

We have to recognize that in this matter there is a somewhat acute difference between the lay and the clerical ideal of what an English clergyman should be. For the third type, it must be acknowledged, is popular in lay circles rather than in clerical circles. The English three-fold ministry, which the ordinary layman regards perhaps with good-tempered tolerance as serving an important use in our social and national life, is presented in the following verses deliberately misquoted, with apologies:

'Our curate is a bluff man,
A never rude or rough man,
A light your pipe and puff man,
English to the core.

Our vicar is a good man,
A really would if he could man,
A not yet out of the wood man,
English to the core.

Our Bishop is a sound man,
A won't run the ship aground man,
A here we go round and round man,
Very slow — but sure.'[1]

All our Christian idealists, all our ecclesiastical fanatics, all our socialist sentimentalists demand something much less pedestrian. They will maintain that such clergy are too much compassed with infirmity — two much lacking in consciousness of their office and its duties, too humdrum and too commonplace to be stewards of the Divine Mysteries, preachers of the Eternal Gospel, prophets and heralds of the Kingdom of God. Nevertheless, these are the clergy which the English people desire if they desire any clergy at all. And such clergy have done more to develop the Christian character of the English people and to

[1] The original, by R. H. Smith, describing the Prime Minister, appeared in the *Spectator* of July 24th, 1936.

make our English civilization the nearest approach to the Kingdom of God on earth that mankind has yet experienced. It is not professional qualifications but character : it is not eloquence but example : it is not self-conscious emotionalism but simple, sincere, intelligent and unselfish service which commends and extends the Christian religion in the modern world.

We publish in our correspondence pages in this issue under the heading, 'The Catholic Communist Modernist,' an ideal of the English clergyman and his activities which a small but influential group of church leaders is seeking to promote. We have little doubt that one of the influences behind the appointment of the Archbishops' Commission is connected with endeavours to propagate this type of clergyman. This group desires that the clergyman to-day in England should be primarily a social revolutionary and economic reformer and one who is resolved to use his office in the Church for this purpose.

The soldier in a cassock and the politician in a biretta have played and do play their part on the Continent, but our laity have no use for them in this country. This is because English people generally are convinced that politics and economics are not the 'parson's job.' They think, and they have good authority for doing so, that it is not the function of the clergy to turn stones into bread, but to teach men 'that man doth not live by bread alone' and that if we seek first the Kingdom of God and its righteousness, all things needful for this life shall be added unto us. If the clergyman feels he must go beyond this in the face of economic misery and social injustice, then, following the example of the Rev. Charles Jenkinson of Leeds, who led the way in making that great city slum-conscious, he may act, not as a clergyman but as a citizen, through our municipal and political institutions.

Coronation Service Controversy.

The proposal made by Dr. Barnes, the Bishop of Birmingham, for alterations in the Coronation Service which we supported in our November issue, has not been well received by Dr. Blunt, the Bishop of Bradford, who took occasion in his Presidential Address to the Bradford Diocesan Conference (December 1st) to criticize the proposal adversely. Dr. Barnes'

proposal was twofold, (1) to separate the Holy Communion Service from the Coronation Service proper, and (2) to admit representatives of other great Christian denominations to take part in the Coronation Service.

Speaking of the first proposal Dr. Blunt said :

> 'Such an action might well suit those who regard all sacramental ordinances as effete superstition. It would certainly minister to a derogatory view of the Holy Communion service. To agree to it would be tantamount to a confession that the grace of the sacrament is not so important as to be needed by the King at this great moment of his inauguration. It would be a public humiliation of the Church's chief act of worship and chief means of sacramental grace' (*Times*, Dec. 2, 1936).

Dr. Blunt would seem to have entirely misconceived both the intention and the character of the Bishop of Birmingham's proposal. There was no suggestion that the service of Holy Communion should not be celebrated on Coronation day nor that the King himself should not communicate at such a service. The proposal was simply that the Holy Communion Service should be separated from the Coronation Service. To characterize such a proposal as 'a public humiliation of the Church's chief act of worship' is, we regret to say, as grotesque as it is illogical. And to interpret the Bishop of Birmingham's proposal as intended to express the feelings of those 'who regard all Sacramental ordinances as effete superstition' is a painful example of the *odium theologicum*. Dr. Barnes has nowhere described the Holy Communion as an 'effete superstition,' but has pleaded that its true moral and spiritual significance should be separated from the materialistic, magical and superstitious practices and doctrines most improperly associated with it, and which only serve to discredit the Sacrament in the eyes of many, and to repel them from it. To claim, as Dr. Blunt does, that to separate the Holy Communion from the Coronation Service 'would certainly minister to a derogatory view of the Holy Communion Service' is the very opposite of what is intended by the proposal.

There have been plans for the broadcasting of the Coronation Service. Such broadcasting may be desirable in the case of the Coronation Service itself, but many religious persons of all denominations would regard it as inadvisable, perhaps even irreverent, to broadcast the Service of Holy Communion.

In the mediaeval Church of England it was the rule to celebrate the Holy Communion at both Marriage and Funeral Services, but in post-Reformation times the Holy Communion has been separated from these services, and we cannot but think that this has been with religious advantage. To-day it is the custom for devout people to attend an early celebration of the Holy Communion before the actual marriage or funeral service.

Moreover, with the rise of the Oxford Movement (although we believe the practice actually originated with an Evangelical) the Holy Communion Service has been separated from the Service of Morning Prayer and Litany with which it was invariably conjoined. Many good parish priests would maintain that this practice has assisted greatly to contribute to the devout reception of the Holy Communion.

The only services, with the exception of the Coronation Service, to which the Holy Communion is invariably conjoined at the present time, are the Ordination Services, and we are of opinion that here separation would be advantageous and not least in the interests of devotion, as these united services are too long for the highest level of devotion to be maintained throughout them save by very exceptional persons. Opinion may differ as to the advisability of this separation, but to charge those who propose it with dishonouring the Sacrament is monstrous.

With regard to Dr. Barnes' second proposal, to admit the Free Churches, Dr. Blunt said :

> 'Something has been said in some quarters as to the possibility of inviting representatives of denominations other than the Church of England, in particular of the Free Churches, to take part in the ceremony. Such suggestions can only have been made by those who for the moment forget what is the nature of the Coronation ceremony and what it involves. If, as I have said, it were merely a service of prayer and aspiration it would be natural and it would be easy — most of us would gladly concede it — that the representatives of other Christian bodies should have a share in it.
>
> 'But the service is not of such a character. In the first place, it is a sacramental rite closely tied to the Anglican service of Holy Communion, and it would be quite illegitimate to hand over a part in the administration of such a rite to any who do not share our belief as to the nature, efficacy, and primacy of sacramental ordinances in Church worship. And, in the second place, the whole service definitely marks the position of the Church of England as an Established Church. The very idea of Establishment is foreign and uncongenial to the Free Church system. It is not logical or reasonable that they should be asked to take a part in a ceremony so completely at variance with the

> position which in every other respect they claim to occupy. They cannot have it both ways — they cannot be hostile to the idea of Establishment and at the same time take a share in something which the Church of England does in its specific capacity as the Established Church. Nor can the Church of England reasonably be asked to bear all the difficulties of its Established position while at the same time it renounces the privilege and responsibility which on this occasion belong to it in virtue of that position.'

Dr. Blunt's argument will only strike the majority of Englishmen (if they trouble to read it) as an example of clericalist exclusiveness and as lacking in that spirit of genial charity and generous large-heartedness which should characterize the atmosphere of general rejoicing and national unity which it is hoped will mark the Coronation celebrations.

Dr. Blunt's phrase, 'merely a service of prayer and aspiration,' must seem to many a very strange one, especially as coming from a bishop. Is not prayer and aspiration not only the very essence of Christian worship but also one of its highest aspects? Especially when such prayer and aspiration are united to the spirit of charity.

It seems to us that a Coronation Service breathing the spirit of the Lord's Prayer is the kind of service which on the one hand would evoke the most heartfelt devotion, and on the other hand would enable all Christians within the Empire, and indeed many who do not bear the Christian name, to take part in it. It should not be beyond the power of our Church authorities to frame such a service nor against their will to authorize it.

Negotiations with the Rumanian Church.

Inter-Communion between the English Church and all other Christian denominations is sincerely desired by the vast majority of English Church-people who give any thought to the matter; provided that such inter-communion is not purchased at the price of sacrificing the principles and character of the Church of England.

Recent English negotiations with the Rumanian Church would seem to threaten such a disaster in the estimation of many Evangelical Churchmen. Statements were made by our English representatives about the authority of the Thirty-Nine Articles, the authority of Tradition, the number of Sacraments, and the doctrine of the Eucharist, which might easily be so

construed as to misrepresent the distinctive teaching of the Church of England on these controversial points. As Modernists, we have no desire to treat these ancient controversies or to re-open discussion upon them. We desire fellowship with all Christians, but not on the basis of our all thinking alike on a great number of doctrinal and ecclesiastical issues. Our basis ought to be that of common loyalty to the Divine Father as unveiled in Christ and of united endeavour to advance the Kingdom of God on earth. Firm in this conviction we cannot admit the right either of the Rumanians or of our representatives to be Inquisitors into a number of ancient controversial problems embedded and we could hope for ever buried in the history of both Churches. We cannot but fear that our representatives, in seeking to find a formula of agreement, have misled the Rumanians as to the distinctive position of the Church of England. We do not stand where they stand in these matters, and there is no use in pretending that we do. In their way of thinking the Rumanians would appear to be dominated by their ecclesiastical past which they regard as infallible, whereas we English Churchmen have resolutely declined, as our history shows, to be dominated in this way. Whilst we value the continuity of Christian thought and desire to maintain the continuity of Christian institutions, we hold that we are required at the bidding of the Holy Spirit and by our own enlarging Christian experience to transcend the old. We ought not to give the Rumanians the impression that our position, as Churchmen, is static or that we can rest in security upon our past. The Church of England as Edmund Burke, one of the greatest of our English political philosophers, has asserted, 'is a Church professing fallibility.' It is a Church in whose eyes the claims of practical love, scientific truth, and personal freedom are of increasing importance. We refuse either to be dominated by the past or to be entangled by it. We cannot sell our birthright, as English Churchmen, at the price of inter-communion with the Rumanians, nor pretend that we value some of the things at the rate at which they value them or that we agree with them in a number of their ecclesiastical convictions. They must accept us as we really are with all our imperfections on our head, and we are ready to accept them as they are and admit them into Christian fellowship with us.

What we are, they should be able to discover by a study of our history, our institutions, our formularies, and our spirit. If they will do this they will not be misled, as we fear they have been, by certain sectional declarations, well-intended no doubt, but not truly representative of the Church of England. Moreover, we shall not have been led inadvertently into restricting that Christian freedom which is our heritage and upon the retention of which our power of progress and influence depends in no small measure. Furthermore, we are compelled to add that there is a feeling of apprehension in some English Church circles that 'the explanations' given by our English representatives may in the near future be used to hinder the advance towards inter-communion with our English Free Churches. This is so serious a danger that it is most important that our Church authorities should publicly disavow the possibility of such a use being made of these 'explanations.'

THE MENACE OF GAMBLING*

By the Ven. Richard Brook, M.A., Archdeacon of Coventry and Rector of Rugby.

GAMBLING has been described by Lord Snowden as the 'distinctive vice of our age.' The evil, he adds, is so terrible and widespread and such a menace to national morality and well-being, that if it is allowed to continue and to grow, it will defeat every movement for social and moral advance.

If this is true, and I do not think it would be disputed by any who have knowledge of the crowded populations of the industrial areas, then it is the duty of the Church to call on its members to use every effort to combat the evil, and to endeavour to enlist the support of all men of good-will in their purpose.

In regard to this, as in regard to so many other social evils, the first step towards making the bad people good, is to make the good people care. A great part of the difficulty in dealing with

* The substance of a Sermon preached before the University in the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, on October 25th, 1936.

the gambling evil is that those who are not directly affected by it themselves, or have not been brought into direct contact with its devastating and demoralizing consequences fail, as a rule, to recognize either the extent of the evil, or their duty as Christian people in regard to it. Here is an admitted social evil — a more prolific source of evil at the present time, perhaps, than any other — certainly a far greater evil than what is called the 'drink evil.' To say that it is no concern of ours, because we ourselves are not addicted to it, or because we do not find it doing any harm either to our character or to our financial position, is in effect to repudiate our social responsibility as Christians. No man liveth to himself alone, and each is his brother's keeper.

I am myself prepared to maintain that gambling in all its forms is always wrong. The essence of a gamble is that it is a transaction which involves the distribution of wealth on the basis of chance. It is true that the element of skill frequently enters into what are commonly called gambling transactions — betting on horse-racing, football pool betting, playing cards for money, certain kinds of buying and selling on the Stock Exchange. Those who have wider experience of these activities than I have will be better able to say whether it is skill or chance which mainly determines the result. The sort of skill involved is not always of a kind that we should appraise very highly. Often it consists of little more than the ability to take advantage of other people, and might more truly be described as 'cunning.' But in so far as skill is the determining factor, the transaction ceases to be a gamble. The best example of a pure gamble is the sweep-stake, the result of which is wholly a matter of chance.

I would maintain that gambling, so defined, rests on an unsound social principle, a principle which in the last resort is indefensible. In a rightly organized community wealth ought to be distributed, not on the basis of chance, but on the basis of men's efforts, or their needs, or their merits. It is true that society is not at present organized on that basis, nor is it possible that it ever should be wholly so organized. The element of chance cannot be eliminated from life. But that is no reason why we should make things worse by deliberately enlarging its area. The progressive lessening of the area in which chance is operative, is one of the marks of advancing civilization. The system

of insurance is sometimes quoted as an exception. It is said that insurance itself is a gamble. The converse, of course, is true. The purpose of insurance is to provide against the inevitable chances of life, and it is not the man who insures, but the man who refuses to insure, who is the real gambler.

Not only does reason bid us make provision, as far as possible, against the chances of life, but it is always the purpose of the social reformer so to re-organize society, that increasingly the good things of life shall go to those who need them, or to those who deserve them, or to those who will use them primarily for the benefit of mankind, so that the accident of birth or environment and the changes and chances of life shall progressively count for less. As against this purpose, gambling is a set-back and in this sense, I would urge, may rightly be described as being in all cases 'wrong' because socially undesirable.

This, however, is not to say that every person who gambles is necessarily vicious, or that the desire for the excitement of a 'flutter' springs from any viciousness of character. The actual amount of harm present in a small bet between those who can easily afford it is, on any view, negligible. Moreover, a great many people do, in fact, derive a great deal of pleasure out of what is admittedly for them a quite harmless recreation. To this extent it may be said that there is positive good in gambling, since pleasure, provided it is harmless, is in itself a good thing. It is true that the pleasure derived from gambling is not of a very high order. Most people spend most of their working time in the endeavour to make money: that they should also spend their spare time in the same pursuit, that their idea of recreation should be the getting of money without working for it, implies a somewhat sordid outlook. But there is no reason to condemn a pleasure which is harmless on the sole ground that it is just an amusement and has no moral or intellectual or physical value. After all, recreation ceases to be recreation if it is undertaken with the deliberate purpose of deriving benefit from it. Our recreations, provided they do not harm us, or anyone else, are our own concern. To those less fortunately placed than we are, whose lives are dull and drab and monotonous, gambling adds as nothing else does, a spice of interest. This is particularly true of the unemployed, and of those whose work in these days of the

mechanization of industry is devoid of interest. To these, gambling provides an easy method of escape from the dreariness of life and is an antidote to boredom. Nor can there be any doubt that this is one of the main causes of the increase of gambling in recent years. On these lines I heard it argued once, at a Diocesan Conference, that the unemployed were better and more happily occupied on a fine summer evening at the Dog Race Track, than in a public-house or a cinema, and that they should not be grudged this amusement.

I have also heard it argued that since gambling, and the facilities for gambling, not only provide amusement for the unemployed, but also in so doing help to make them contented with their unfortunate lot, any attempt to deprive them of what has come to be one of their main interests in life, would, without doubt, provoke them to a more active discontent with their position, and might have serious social consequences. This, however, is not so much a justification of gambling as a condemnation of the conditions under which it has recently assumed such wide dimensions and for which undoubtedly it provides some palliative. Quite plainly our Christian duty lies not in the mere assertion that gambling rests on an unsound social principle and is therefore wrong — to those who are the victims of our present social system this argument would carry little weight: nor does it lie in the mere denunciation of the pleasure as an unworthy one — to those who know no better it is the most attractive form of pleasure open to them. The duty lies rather in providing some better thing, not least in providing through our educational system some better training in the use of leisure. And if gambling were just a harmless form of recreation, we might perhaps leave it at this, and perhaps allow that it has a rightful — even a valuable place — in our social system. But the trouble is, that for most people who indulge in it, gambling quickly ceases to be a harmless recreation.

It is not merely that among the poorer classes money is wasted on gambling that ought to be spent on food and the necessities of life. It is by no means uncommon for 20 or 25 per cent. of the weekly income of working-class households to be spent on horse-racing, dog-racing, or football pool betting. We may, of course, regard it as solely a man's own concern i

he is foolish enough, as we say, to 'put his shirt' on a horse: plainly it is a quite different matter when he deals with his children's shirts, and boots, and food, in the same way, and this is what is happening in countless homes to-day.

Nor is it merely that the desire to get money for betting, and the hope of getting money by betting, frequently leads, and not only among the poorer classes, to dishonesty and other crime. I should very much doubt whether even here there is one of us who does not know of at least one case in which gambling has ended in poverty or in prison, and anyone who has lived in an industrial area could quote from his own knowledge a large number of such cases. A memorandum submitted by the Home Office to the Committee on the Betting Duty in 1923, when the evil was much less widespread than it is to-day, said:

> 'It is an undoubted fact, which can be established by over-whelming evidence from those who have the widest and most intimate experience of the working of the Criminal Law, that a very large proportion of offences of dishonesty committed by first offenders, persons who have hitherto been regarded as honest, are attributable to excessive betting.'

It is not merely this, for these are extreme cases. The evil goes deeper and spreads wider. It is the resultant degradation of character which is the most serious consequence. The habit of gambling, once it is indulged in, tends to create a craving, at least as strong as the craving for drink, or drugs. It very quickly becomes an obsession, absorbing all a man's thoughts and energies, diverting them into this one particular channel. It has been estimated that gambling amongst all classes of workers reduces the national output by 20 per cent.—due to wasted time, bad work, spoiled material and friction in the workshops. Worse still, it fosters in men's minds the idea that money can be more easily obtained by betting than by working, and that they may rightly receive large portions of the common wealth for which they have rendered no service and to which their only title is luck: so it develops habits of idleness and carelessness, and weakens the habit of thrift, and destroys the sense of social responsibility.

> 'The desire to get something for nothing, and the passion for excitement which it nourishes, are always demoralizing, and in their worst forms lead to utter corruption of character.'

When I lived in Doncaster we used to say that Race Week brought into the town the scum of the earth. It was quite true, but it was not only among those who tramped into the town and crowded the common, that one saw those who might rightly be so described. The same description was equally applicable to some of those who came in their Rolls Royce cars, and did their business in the enclosure. Here I can speak with first-hand knowledge. I can speak with first-hand knowledge also of what are called Giant Whist Drives, where valuable prizes are given. It is only necessary to watch the people playing to see its effect upon them. They were, most of them, at their worst and not at their best. Avarice was written on their faces: they looked mean and hard. Many of them were, in ordinary life, apparently quite honest and respectable people, but the most elaborate precautions had to be taken to prevent their cheating. I have rarely witnessed a more sickening sight. I will only add that most of us would hesitate to appoint to any position of responsibility or trust, a person who was known to be an habitual gambler, or one who devoted his spare time to backing horses, or to such opportunities of gambling as the Stock Exchange provides.

I do not wish to labour this point, still less to exaggerate. I would, however, venture to plead for a wider study of the evidence presented to the Royal Commission on Betting and Gambling, more especially that presented by the Christian Social Council. The evidence is conclusive, and to those who might be disposed to doubt the extent of the evil — the vast number of people affected by it, including children and adolescents, its demoralizing effect on their character and their outlook on life, its ramifications, its penetration of every section of the community — it will be, if I may use the phrase, an 'eye-opener.' I want rather to ask the question, what can be done about it, and, more particularly, what can we do about it?

No one line of action will suffice. Since one of the main causes of the recent increase of gambling is to be found in present-day social conditions, educational training in the right use of leisure, as I have already pointed out, and the provision of additional facilities for healthy recreation, is essential. But there are also other and more direct ways of dealing with the evil.

Prohibition is, of course, out of the question. If a man wishes

to gamble, nothing that we can do will prevent him. The failure of the 'drink' prohibition in America should be a sufficient warning against the adoption of any such method. On the other hand, the experience we have had in this country in dealing with—and, on the whole, in dealing very successfully with—the drink evil, shows a better method. State control of the drink trade has, without doubt, lessened the drink evil, and State control of the gambling and betting trade—for such it has become—will do much to lessen the gambling evil. The Report of the Royal Commission established the fact that drastic legislation was necessary.

The Betting and Lotteries Act of 1933 was important, not merely for its provisions, but also as an attempt to express in Law a reasoned conception of what the attitude of the State towards gambling should be. Legislation must not invade the realm of private habit, nor should it be based on the ethical objections to gambling. But the State has the right and the duty to protect its members from the temptations placed in their way by those who make it their business to exploit the gambling instinct for their private profit. The recent growth of gambling is no doubt due, in part, to the general social conditions, but it is due far more to the provision on a wide scale of opportunities of gambling and incitements to it organized for private gain, and very skilfully organized with all the publicity that advertisement will give and with a vast army of paid canvassers and agents working in shops and factories, even in schools also. It is with this that legislation should, and can deal.

A case in point was the Irish Sweepstake. It will not, I imagine, be supposed that the promoters were concerned for the well-being of the hospitals. In 1932, out of the total receipts, the sum of £900,000 was spent on what were called expenses, including the promoters' remuneration, but no details of this expenditure were given. It is not possible therefore to know exactly what the promoters got for themselves: there is little doubt that they found it a very profitable enterprise. Or again, the Greyhound Racing Courses, opened by private companies in all the larger centres of population, irrespective of the wishes of the residents, or of the injury to the amenities of the neighbourhood are, of course, purely commercial enterprises. They are also

very lucrative ones, as their balance-sheets show. More important still has been the organization and amazingly rapid growth of football pool betting. Here, also, it is not possible to compute with accuracy the profits made by the promoters, as they are under no obligation to publish detailed figures. Some of the firms advertise deductions of from 5 per cent. to 10 per cent. of the takings, for profits, over and above the deductions made for expenses : others do not specify the proportion of the deductions. With a total outlay of over nine million pounds each season, a profit of one million pounds for the promoters is only a modest estimate. A friend of mine, a Labour Member for the West Riding, who has seen among his own constituents what the system really means, has described it as 'an easy means of swindling the poor.' No better description of it could be given :

> 'the whole thing,' he adds, 'is organized for private gain, without a thought of the social consequences. It calls aloud for Government action.'

The Act of 1934 may be welcomed as a first instalment, but as a first instalment only, and it is interesting to note the effect it has already had. It deals with three phases of gambling — Lotteries, Greyhound Racing and Competitions. It prohibits any form of large lotteries and imposes stringent regulations on such small lotteries as are permitted. It has silenced, for the time being, at any rate, the demand for State lotteries for charitable and other purposes, and it has had a marked effect upon the Irish Sweepstake. The receipts for the Derby Sweepstake this year were about £770,000 less than for the Derby of 1934; more significant, however, are the figures in regard to the sources from which the contributions come. Prior to the passing of the Act, over 68 per cent. came from England alone. Since the passing of the Act only 37 per cent. has come from Europe, including England. In the last Sweep, 50 per cent. came from the United States and Canada.

The Act has been even more effective in dealing with the Greyhound Racing Tracks. It has limited the amount of racing at each of them, and has reduced their number. In 1932 there were more than 300 of them : now there are just over 200. The value of the Act has been further proved by the defeat of several

applications for the opening of new tracks, where opposition has been organized largely by the local churches. Unfortunately the Act legalized the Tote, contrary to the recommendations of the Commission. But the profits derived from it by the promoters have been so cut down that in all probability the smaller courses will not be able to pay their way, and the profits of the larger ones will be considerably restricted. Further, the Act dealt, and successfully, with newspaper and other competitions of a gambling character, which, as the Report of the Commission showed, were becoming a source of danger; the amount of money offered in prizes has been reduced to about one-third of what it was before the passing of the Act.

But further legislation is necessary. Football Pool Betting was excluded from the Act because it was not found possible to deal with the whole question of 'off the course' betting. This constitutes a separate problem and should be dealt with without delay. It is much to be regretted that, despite considerable pressure, the Government has, so far, refused to take any action. On the other hand, the pressure of public opinion has led the promoters of the pools to take steps to reform themselves; but each season shows a great increase in the amount of money spent on them. Another point of importance is the Automatic Gaming Machines, which are to be found at most of the fairs and in amusement centres, turning them into actual casinos.

Recent events, as was pointed out in a letter to the *Times* the other day, including the manipulation of the Pepper Market and the enquiry with regard to Budget Leakages, have revealed the existence of speculative transactions of a gambling nature, into which, as a preliminary to legislative action, enquiry should be made. The terms of reference of the Royal Commission did not allow for such enquiry, and investigation might very possibly justify a reversion to the law enforced during the war and immediately afterwards, which made such speculative transactions as 'options' and 'carry-overs' illegal, by ordering that dealings in stocks and shares must be for cash payments. Such speculations are not only injurious to those immediately concerned, but are a menace to financial stability.

Urgently necessary, too, is legislation in regard to the publication in the Press of bookmakers' and tipsters' advertisements

and of betting news and starting prices. This was stated by the Royal Commission to be one of the chief causes of the growth of gambling. The Press indeed has become an active agent in the promotion of betting, and now has a vested interest in its continuance. There is no doubt that a large number of evening newspapers — to say nothing of those which are almost entirely concerned with betting news — would have to cease publication if they were not allowed to give the daily list of winners and prices. The publication of such items is, I believe, prohibited in Canada. It could be prohibited here if public opinion were to demand it. It is the prohibition of the publication of information about the Irish Sweepstake which, more than anything else, has reduced the amount contributed from this country. To some extent this purpose is being achieved by the blacking out of all betting news in the papers in the news rooms of the Public Libraries in many of the large towns. This has been done primarily in the interests of those who wish to read other parts of the papers and has had the effect of clearing the reading rooms of a large number of undesirables.

But legislative action alone will not suffice : legislation which goes beyond public opinion is futile. The prior need is the education of public opinion. Here, much can be done by the Churches, more especially through the Sunday Schools and Youth Organizations. In my view the Churches, more especially the Church of England, are signally failing to discharge this duty. In fact, their hands are not always clean. I once attended a Band of Hope Children's Christmas Party. Among the various games provided for the children there were some which, in a casino, would have been called roulette, or chemin de fer. It is true that the prizes were only bars of chocolate of different sizes and prices. I pointed out to the organizer of the party that any good he might be doing by keeping the children from drink was more than counter-balanced by the alternative pleasure he was teaching them to enjoy. And there is always the greatest possible difficulty in persuading those who are trying to raise money for Church purposes not to resort to the very simple and very lucrative devices of raffles and lotteries. So long as these continue the moral witness of the Church is vitiated at its source.

In this educational work the co-operation of the State should be enlisted. For many years now the evils of the misuse of alcohol have been effectively presented to the older children in the schools, as part of their training in citizenship, in the syllabus of instruction on the hygiene of food and drink drawn up by the Board of Education. It is much to be desired that a similar syllabus showing the economic, social and moral evils of gambling should be drawn up and authorized for use in schools.

But there is also something which each of us can do in the educating of public opinion. We can, and as Christian people we should, study the problem in all its bearings, and commend it to the consideration and to the conscience of all men of good-will. There is a still more excellent way. I have already compared the gambling evil with the drink evil. A couple of generations ago, a noble band of social workers pledged themselves to total abstinence. Their example and their influence, despite at times a certain intemperance in their language, has accounted for much. I am not a teetotaler myself : I think their work is done. But I believe that this new evil can be attacked—and successfully attacked—by this same method, and so, I believe, there is a clear call to-day to those who will view the gambling evil in the light of the social obligations of their Christian discipleship, to be, and to declare themselves to be, total abstainers from all forms of gambling, more particularly all forms of organized gambling—not necessarily on the ground that it is in itself wrong, but on the ground that it has become a source of serious evil in our national life, and that it is their deliberate purpose to use their influence and their example to combat it.

THE ODYSSEY OF AN INTELLECTUAL

By the Rev. Roger B. Lloyd.

NOBODY who has seized and read with delight each of Mr. Aldous Huxley's books as it came out, could suppose that the author was particularly friendly to religion. In so far as the icy disdain of which, so far as his books give evidence, his character is mostly compounded, allowed him to undertake the passion of any crusade, his life seemed to be given to the destruction of religion by means of the exaltation of the purely scientific habit of mind which he espoused. One of the comments in his anthology, *Texts and Pretexts*, gives the motif of his earlier writings. On Keats' sonnet, written in disgust of vulgar superstition,

> 'The church bells toll a melancholy round,
> Calling the people to some other prayers,
> Some other gloominess, more dreadful cares,
> More hearkening to the sermon's horrid sound.'

he comments, 'Clericalism is still a danger — witness the fate of unhappy Ireland; therefore anti-clericalism is still a duty. Vicariously, through the agency of Keats and Rimbaud, I do my bit.' Then he praises the Rimbaud poem on the ground that it is genuine poetry, and also genuine anti-clericalism. 'He makes us actually *smell* the priest's fermenting boots — ugh, with what unforgettable disgust!' That gives what seems to many of his readers to be the essential Huxley. That is his attitude towards life. His main affirmation was itself a negative, *ecrasez l'infame*, and to the joyous work of destroying religious pretentions he devoted several of his books.

The volume of essays, *Do What You Will*, took various great names in the history of religion — Pascal, St. Francis, Wordsworth, Dean Swift — and subjected them to a wholly destructive analysis, and such was the verve and energy manifest in that book that it entirely escaped the notice of its author, one of the most exact and learned thinkers of our time, that he was destroying as religion something which neither Church nor Bible had ever taught. Then, in *Point Counter Point*, he set up the modern viking, Mark Rampion, in order to give further point to the alternative way of life which he espoused, the way to which

he himself gave the name of Balanced Excess. It may be true that in that brilliant but unhappy novel Mr. Huxley himself is not to be identified with Mark Rampion so much as with Francis Quarles. It is noticeable that although Quarles was unable to believe in Rampion's ravings for more than a quarter of an hour at a time, yet he believed in them far more than he believed in anything else.

Yes, if there is one subject under heaven upon which Mr. Huxley might have been said finally to have made up his mind, it was about the Christian religion. Book after book returned to the attack, and although he appeared to be unable to leave the subject alone, that inability, as *Proper Studies* showed, was not due so much to the haunting fascination which the figure of Christ exercised upon him, for the figure of Christ almost never appears in any of his books, as to his very deep sense of history. To anyone who has as pervasive a sense of history as Mr. Huxley, religion cannot be ignored merely because it has manifestly played so great a part in the shaping of history. He himself, with his deep knowledge of human nature, has never made the mistake of supposing that because he belongs to a generation which has on the whole little use for religion, therefore everybody else shares his disdain. In *Proper Studies* he more than once rather acidly reminds his Bloomsbury followers that while he himself is as convinced an anti-clericalist as ever, yet they would probably be making a profound mistake if they thought that because religion was having a rather bad time in their own day, therefore it would never revive again. Religions, as he says, have a nasty habit of not knowing when they are dead. They are rather like the hydra. When you have cut off its head it at once starts growing another, and all is to do again.

Nothing, however, seemed less likely than that his own attitude towards life would change. He seemed a highly critical and purely detached spectator of life. His analyses of one side of life after another were brilliant and devastating, but they gave the impression always of a man who had no kind of feeling for the lives whose motives he was dissecting. He dwelt on Mount Olympus, and from that point of view watched the mechanism of human life with an almost infinite understanding, except for one or two serious blind spots, but with an infinite lack equally of love and of hatred. In him there was nothing of the creative

disgust of a D. H. Lawrence. No one ever looked less like a social reformer than he.

In the face of such a background, one hesitates long before announcing that signs of a change are now visible. It would certainly appear to be more difficult for the Ethiopian to change his skin than for Mr. Huxley to be publicly sympathetic towards religion, much less to show some signs of embracing it. Yet, if such a change is not in process of taking place, it is difficult to know what one is to make of *Eyeless in Gaza*. It is perhaps the most brilliant of his novels. Yet the difference between that and *Point Counter Point* is profound. *Point Counter Point* is brilliant, and little else. But *Eyeless in Gaza* is brilliant and much more besides.

All authors caution their readers from time to time against imagining that the thoughts and words of their heroes are to be taken as disguised self-portraits. One therefore struggles against the impression that Anthony Beavis in *Eyeless in Gaza* is to be understood as a portrait in terms of fiction of Mr. Huxley's development. Yet the more one struggles, the more one is driven to the belief that such in fact it is. The whole of Anthony's mental processes are almost exactly those of Mr. Huxley, as he has protrayed them in succeeding volumes of essays. There is the same passion for analysis, the same fear of emotion, the same anxiety not to be too convinced about anything in case one's freedom should be gently stolen, the same passion for personal and unencumbered liberty. All of these traits are clearly parts of the essential character of Mr. Huxley. Every one of them is exhibited in the life of Anthony Beavis. Besides this, there are too many recognizable portraits in the book for the likeness to be wholly accidental. The portrait of Mark Staithes, with whom Anthony Beavis went to Mexico, is unquestionably D. H. Lawrence. No one could read the letters of that unhappy prophet without realising that Mark Staithes and D. H. Lawrence are in fact one and the same person. Nor could anyone read those letters without realizing again that what Mark Staithes was to Anthony Beavis, D. H. Lawrence was to Aldous Huxley.

If it be conceded that there is ground for supposing that Anthony Beavis and Aldous Huxley are at least related, if not identical, then *Eyeless in Gaza* becomes a greater puzzle than ever unless, incredibly, it is the herald of Mr. Huxley's conver-

sion to the Christian faith. Take, for example, the passage in which his friend's mother, Mrs. Foxe, is talking to the two boys about Christ:

> '"And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour." Mrs. Foxe lowered her book. "That's one of those additions I was telling you about," she said, "one of those embroideries on the story. One must think of the age in which the writers of the gospels lived. They believed these things could happen on important occasions. They wanted to do honour to Jesus; they wanted to make his story seem more wonderful. But to us, nowadays, these things make it seem less wonderful; and we don't feel that they do him honour. The wonderful thing for us," she went on, and her voice thrilled with a deep note of fervour, "is that Jesus was a man, no more able to do miracles and no more likely to have them done for him than the rest of us. Just a man — and yet he could do what he did, he could be what he was. That's the wonder."
>
> There was a long silence; only the clock ticked and the flame rustled silkily in the grate. Anthony lay on his back and stared at the ceiling. Everything was suddenly clear. Uncle James was right; but the other people were right too. She had shown how it was possible for both of them to be right. Just a man — and yet . . . Oh, he too, he too would do and be!'

It comes early in the book, and though Beavis struggles against the impressions then made, they never leave him until the last page is turned. It would, one would have thought, be quite impossible for a man to write with so obvious an air of conviction unless there was something in the portrait of Mrs. Foxe which was to him most profoundly attractive. It is as though religion was at last put to him in the form in which he was able to respond to it. Others had laboured and failed. She laboured without particularly desiring to convert anybody, and though failure was her lot for some time, yet one of the constant features of the life of Anthony Beavis was that no matter how much he might struggle, he never could forget Mrs. Foxe. Always she stretched over him the net of her compelling influence, and he never forgot it.

The book describes his mental odyssey through the grim post-war years. Everything progressively becomes more and more futile; the world grows more and more savage, and has less and less use for men of his kind. He quarrels stupidly with his mistress, and can find no satisfaction anywhere until at last Miller, who is incontestably Canon Sheppard of St. Paul's, comes along with his Peace Crusade. There again the parallel with Aldous Huxley moves closely. Aldous Huxley, as everyone knows, has thrown himself heart and soul into Canon Shep-

pard's Peace Crusade, and spends a large part of his time, just as Anthony Beavis did, in lecturing for it, writing about it, and generally conducting its propaganda. But the effect which Miller had upon Anthony Beavis was more than the mere drawing of him into a crusade for pacifism. It brought to him the peace of mind for which he had all the time been struggling, but which he had never been able to find. In a glorious passage at the end Beavis reflects upon why he had never found that peace, and decides that it was because he was never able to regard himself as being one of the common herd of human beings, sharing in their sorrows, and in their joys. He had been exclusive and aloof, but at last in the word 'unity' he finds the peace which is for him the peace that passes understanding.

> 'Meanwhile there are love and compassion. Constantly obstructed. But, oh, let them be made indefatigable, implacable to surmount all obstacles, the inner sloth, the distaste, the intellectual scorn; and, from without, the other's aversions and suspicions. Affection, compassion—and also, meanwhile, this contemplative approach, this effort to realise the unity of lives and being with the intellect, and at last, perhaps, intuitively in an act of complete understanding . . . United in peace. In peace, he repeated, in peace, in peace. In the depth of every mind, peace. The same peace for all, continuous between mind and mind. . . . Frenzy of evil and separation. In peace there is unity. Unity with other lives. Unity with all being. For beneath all being, beneath the countless identical but separate patterns, beneath the attractions and repulsions, lies peace. The same peace as underlies the frenzy of the mind. Dark peace, immeasurably deep. Peace from pride and hatred and anger, peace from cravings and aversions, peace from all the separating frenzies. Peace through liberation, for peace is achieved freedom. Freedom and at the same time truth. The truth of unity actually experienced.'

But what brings unity? The answer he gives is love, and the gateway to love is in the life of Christ. So peace comes, and Anthony Beavis at last goes off to address the meeting where he is fairly certain that a gang of Fascists are waiting for him and are going to beat him up.

It is, of course, possible that one has made too much of the startling resemblances between Anthony Beavis and Aldous Huxley. Yet they are clear and startling indeed, and if there is anything in them at all, it will not be long before the great and splendid gifts which Mr. Huxley has hitherto turned to the derision of the Christian interpretation of life, will be as enthusiastically listed in its defence. He will be a somewhat difficult convert.

THE OLD GENERATION AND THE NEW

By the Rev. A. Garfield Curnow.

A RE-READING of Sir Edmund Gosse's *Father and Son* confirms the view, now a general one, that in it we have one of the front rank biographies of our language, and a permanent contribution to English literature. On its publication it was censured by some critics as a harsh portrait of the father, and an unfilial act on the part of the son. It is difficult to see any justification for such an estimate. The writer's attitude to his stern parent is, all things considered, one of remarkable respect and affection. A son who refers to his father as 'unique and noble' is not likely to be guilty of an unfilial portrait. At any rate, no echoes of such a judgment are now heard. Mr. Harold Nicholson, in his *Development of English Biography*, describes the book as 'a masterpiece in which, by consummate power of selection, the author has been able to combine the maximum of scientific history with the maximum of literary form.' This may be regarded as the now settled opinion of literary critics.

But *Father and Son* is more than a biographical masterpiece. It is, to quote the sub-title, 'a study of two temperaments'—two temperaments that were, as the author says, 'innately antagonistic.' 'One was born to fly backward, the other could not help being carried forward.' The book is a fascinating and supremely able consideration of the age-long struggle between reactionary and progressive, traditionalist and modernist, authoritarian and revolutionary, and as such we now consider it.

The father, Philip Gosse, was a remarkable combination of the enthusiastic scientist and the rigid theologian, and in neither respect were his interests reproduced in his son. The elder Gosse had no wish that his son should follow in his steps in scientific matters, but the passionate desire of his whole being was that he should continue his religious position. His utter failure in this endeavour suggests lessons of deep importance for all who are interested in the perpetual problem of the rela-

tions between parents and children, present and future, the old generation and the new. The principles illustrated and enforced in *Father and Son* would, if grasped, so as to become part of our mental and moral make-up, save us from some of the commonest and costliest blunders to which our human nature is prone.

'The real distinction,' it has been said, 'is between those who utilise the past and those who canonise the past.' Perhaps the issue of which *Father and Son* treats could not be better stated. Gosse *père* believed that all wisdom was in former days, and distrusted the future. Gosse *fils*, while far from thinking that the past had nothing to teach, was essentially a forward-looking man. And when these two temperaments are thrown together in the same home, unless there is a great deal of grace and common-sense on both sides, bitter conflict is inevitable, as is tragically seen in the story outlined in this book.

The elder Gosse was a member of the community described by Spurgeon as 'those who call themselves Brethren, but are the most unbrotherly brothers that ever existed.' The supreme reach of the spirit of tolerance is to tolerate intolerance, but it is very difficult to be tolerant to Philip Gosse's type of bitterly intolerant Brethrenism. 'He could not admit that a single Unitarian could possibly be redeemed; and he had no hope of eternal salvation for the inhabitants of Catholic countries.' 'That the leaders of European Christianity were sincere, my Father did not attempt to question. But they were all of them wrong, *incorrect*; and no matter how holy their lives, how self-sacrificing their action, they would have to suffer for their inexactitude through aeons of undefined torment.' That is to say, holy living, self-sacrificing conduct, was of far less moment, as far as Philip Gosse's view of things was concerned, than correctness of opinion, exactitude of intellectual belief. To quote another passage: 'As far as the sects agreed with my Father and my Mother, the sects were walking in the light; wherever they differed from them, they had slipped more or less definitely into a penumbra of their own making.' Sir Edmund says that his father was 'no fanatical monomaniac.' We honour him for so saying, but we, who are not restrained by his filial ties, need not scruple to say that such, or very nearly such, he certainly was. And the same thing applies to the mother, who evidently was an

able woman, endowed with an imaginative gift which, as the son plainly hints, might have enabled her to attain eminence as a writer of fiction. But she utterly refused to develop her powers, on the ground that stories thus written would not be 'true,' in her rigidly literal sense of the word. Indeed, she referred to her capacity for imagination, which certainly is one of God's best gifts, and was freely used by Christ Himself, as 'the sin which doth most easily beset me.' This lamentable judgment is just one instance—there are many others in the book—to illustrate the distressful conscience which ruled the moral nature of both parents, the sort of conscience which manufactures artificial sins out of innocent trifles. The author says of his father and mother that 'they lived in an intellectual cell, bounded on its sides by the walls of their own house, but open above to the very heart of the uttermost heavens.' It is not much of the heavens, however, that can be seen from the bottom of a cell, and when one thinks of the sort of heaven Philip Gosse and his wife would have found heavenly, one is reminded of what Robert Burns said of certain of the unco guid of his day.

Such then was the atmosphere in which young Gosse was brought up—narrow, artificial, rigid, painful, exacting, and bitterly intolerant. Both his parents had vigorous minds, but their distinguished accomplishments did not react on their spiritual outlook, which was poor, barren, negative, inhuman. There was a complete absence of perspective in their religion. Fancy a child of seven being compelled to read Newton's *Thoughts on the Apocalypse*, and being spoken to by his mother about 'sorrow and pain, the badges of Christian discipleship.' The religious training which he had was one to encourage priggishness and hypocrisy, an amusing illustration of which is the incident of the party at the Browns. Young Edmund, who had recently been received into full membership with the little company of worshippers at 'the Room,' and was therefore competent to decide the matter for himself, wished to attend. His father, who desired him not to go, urged him to pray about it, and was confident in the result of his advice. 'The Lord says I may go to the Browns',' was the answer announced to the amazed father, and the poor man was hoist with his own petard. This, by the way, is not only one of the most amusing but one

of the most revealing episodes in the book. The anger of Philip Gosse at being nonplussed—'surely it was an error of tactics to slam the door'—shows, one fears, how much exaltation of self was mingled with his religion, and to what an extent the deity whom he worshipped was a magnified capital I.

It seems clear that an atmosphere of grim fear ruled this unhappy household. The idea of religion, the conception of God, on which the whole life of the home was based, was one of almost unmitigated terror. 'The fear of the Lord,' says our writer, 'altogether swallowed up and cancelled any notion of the love of him.' 'The word God,' someone has said, 'is only a picture frame; all its value depends on the quality of portrait which the frame encloses.' The portrait which Gosse's parents placed inside the frame was a dreadful one. The notion of God given him in his lonely, pathetic, fear-ridden childhood explains much that follows. 'Beware,' said the father, in chiding the child for disturbing his bed-side prayer because a beetle was crawling up the clothes to him, 'beware, for God is a jealous God.' On which Sir Edmund justly comments: 'The theory of extreme Puritanism can surely offer no quainter example of its fallacy than this idea that the omnipotent Jehovah could be seriously offended, and could stoop to revenge, because a little nervous child of nine had disturbed a prayer by being frightened at an insect.' Shaftesbury, the seventeenth-century Deist, said that if there is a God He would be less displeased with atheists than with those who accepted Him in the guise of Jehovah. One is reminded of that famous dictum in thinking of the fierce, savage and vindictive being who was the deity of the elder Gosse. People who worship the sort of God in whom Philip Gosse believed are, from the standpoint of the New Testament, engaged in devil worship. To gloss over the matter by such plausible phrases as 'an inadequate conception of God' will not meet the case. It is not a question of inadequacy but of utter irreconcilability. The God of Philip Gosse is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and until this is clearly recognized and plainly affirmed there is no hope of including in the Christian Church many who are outside it because they have inherited a conception of the Divine Being which makes Him repugnant to their moral sense.

Our author probes the root defect of his father's religion in these words: 'With all his faith in the Word of God, he had no confidence in the Divine Benevolence.' What an indictment! Any system of thought which has 'no confidence in the Divine Benevolence' is not Christianity, for such confidence, an utter trust in the love of God, is the very heart and essence of the religion which Jesus founded. The present writer has no knowledge of the religious position of Sir Edmund during the last fifty years of his life. If in any degree, after his youthful revolt, he veered round to the Christian position, it deserves to be reckoned as a miracle of grace, when we consider that he was brought up under a system the keynote of which was 'no confidence in the divine benevolence.' And if he remained outside Christianity all his days, and called himself an atheist, he must be judged compassionately, as one whose mind was shaped under the pressure of that awful handicap.

At the close of *Father and Son* is a poignant passage in which Sir Edmund registers his protest against the type of religion in which his father believed and in which he himself was trained. 'What a charming companion,' he says in words which no one can read without a catch at the heart, 'what a delightful parent, what a courteous and engaging friend my Father would have been, and would pre-eminently have been to me, if it had not been for this stringent piety which ruined it all.' And he goes on to pillory this 'stringent piety' in words the justice of which cannot be impugned: 'It sets up a vain, chimerical ideal, in the barren pursuit of which all the tender, indulgent affections, all the genial play of life, all the exquisite pleasures and soft resignations of the body, all that enlarges and calms the soul, are exchanged for what is harsh and void and negative. It encourages a stern and ignorant spirit of condemnation; it throws altogether out of gear the healthy movement of the conscience; it invents virtues which are sterile and cruel; it invents sins which are no sins at all, but which darken the heaven of innocent joy with futile clouds of remorse.' Sharp and indignant words; and in them the condemnation of Philip Gosse's type of faith is for ever writ. The Man of Nazareth must weep that His gracious and beautiful religion could ever by anyone be so tragically misinterpreted.

Have we altogether outgrown this sort of thing nowadays? Sir Edmund refers to 'the revolution which has overturned the puritanism of which he [his father] was perhaps the last surviving type.' It may be true that there are few or none of Philip Gosse's sort left to-day. One wonders! But the self-same spirit is certainly to be met with. There are two main directions in which it may be traced.

The first is in obscurantist views of truth. Mr. A. C. Benson observes of George Macdonald that 'he remains for ever one of those happy natures who never suffer the disastrous doom of being able precisely to formulate their conclusions,' and continues: 'To make up your mind about life is probably the shortest way to missing the meaning of it.' That, of course, is not a plea for having no convictions, but rather for not writing a final Q.E.D. after every question. Philip Gosse was far too sure of things. There were no mysteries in his intellectual universe, and when there are no mysteries in a man's universe it is a sure sign that it is no universe at all, but a mere backyard. Lord Balfour makes the shrewd remark that a man may use his mind as his accomplice rather than as his guide, and that is exactly what Philip Gosse did. His whole life was a seeking for arguments to prove what he already believed, rather than a quest for wider truth and a welcoming of new light. Truth to him was what it is to Roman Catholicism, a closed system. 'We have not to find the truth,' as Newman was fond of asserting, 'it is placed in our hands.' That is just what Philip Gosse believed, and the association of these two, who were poles asunder in their ecclesiastical position, in the identity of this viewpoint, is a curious instance of the meeting of extremes. The elder Gosse deliberately closed his eyes to everything that militated against his dogmatic system, than which there is nothing which so surely separates between the old generation and the new.

Perhaps the supreme illustration of his attitude is his once famous part in the 'Genesis and Geology' controversy of a couple of generations ago. Every instinct of his intelligence, his son tells us, went out at first to greet the new light on the mutability of species introduced by Darwin. Almost at once, however, a recollection of the opening chapters of Genesis checked the movement of his mind. He could not escape from

the trend of evidence, and yet in deference to a false notion of revelation he deliberately darkened his understanding, determined to have nothing to do with the new theory, and clung tenaciously to the old idea of the fixity of species. He had inherited 'a definite conception of the absolute, unmodified, and historical veracity, in its direct and obvious sense, of every statement contained within the covers of the Bible.' That is to say, Genesis must be literally true, even if it means that the whole testimony of the world of Nature must be abandoned as false. This surely is the very *reductio ad absurdum* of verbal inspiration, and the very nadir of obscurantism. 'It would be difficult to say,' writes Prof. Bury in his *History of Freedom of Thought*, 'how much harm has been done by the precepts and examples of inhumanity, violence and bigotry which the reverent reader of the Old Testament, implicitly believing in its inspiration, is bound to approve.' Of course, it is plain to us, as it ought to have been to Prof. Bury, that the reverent reader of the Old Testament, implicitly believing in its inspiration, is *not* bound to approve all that he reads. But certainly Philip Gosse did; and where that is the position held, the tragedy seen in his career, though perhaps on a lesser scale and in other ways, and still more the tragedy of his relations with his son, will inevitably be re-enacted.

The second direction in which we may trace the spirit of the elder Gosse to-day is in coercive views of religious training. 'The more a man is sure of his position,' said the late Bishop Creighton, 'the less he will wish to force it upon others, and the more he will trust to the inherent power of truth.' It is difficult for certain natures to realise this; still more difficult for them to act upon it. Undoubtedly a parent has the right — indeed, it is a duty — to train his children in the views of religious truth at which he has himself arrived. But let him be careful how he does it. If he forces the pace or puts on pressure, he will defeat his own ends, as Edmund Gosse is one of a thousand instances to prove. The repressions imposed on him froze the soul of the lad, till it may be said that he never knew what it was to be young until he was old. His mental processes were subjected to a rigid police inspection. His father beset him on every hand with stern *gendarmes théologiques*. No religious independence for him was

to be dreamed of. There must be no right of thinking for himself. Parents and teachers who take up such an attitude in relation to an opening mind are guilty of one of the worst of crimes —the destruction of personality, the crushing of that *differentium* which is each individual's God-given birthright.

The sentence with which *Father and Son* ends—'[it is] a human being's privilege to fashion his inner life for himself'—indicates the right line of approach and the right principle of procedure, as it indicates the fatal defect of the elder Gosse's method. 'He had recognized with reluctance,' says our author concerning his father, 'that holiness was not hereditary, but he continued to hope that it might be compulsive.' It is not, nor ever can be. Coercion in moral training makes either a weakling or a rebel, and of the two let us thank God for the rebel.

THE CENTENARY OF CHARLES SIMEON*

By the Rev. J. F. Clayton, Reader at the Temple Church, M.A., M.C.

Determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.—I Cor. ii, 2.

DETERMINED not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. These words are inscribed on the monument of Charles Simeon in Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge, a leader of the Evangelical party within the Church of England, who died on November 13th, 1836. His centenary is not likely to have been observed as widely as that of the Oxford Movement which occurred in 1933, but to those who value the comprehensive character of the Church of England the centenary of an Evangelical leader is as noteworthy as that of the Oxford Movement out of which has developed the party known as Anglo-Catholic.

In 1836 the Church of England included five groups:—

(1) The old High-Church party standing for Apostolic Suc-

*A sermon preached in the Temple Church on Sunday, November 22, 1936.

cession, Tory politics, and dislike of Dissent. This group is now extinct.

(2) The Low Church party, then represented by such men as Sydney Smith of St. Paul's Cathedral, which made more modest claims for the Church and its ministry, and, even more than others, disliked enthusiasm.

(3) The Evangelicals who had emerged in the middle of the eighteenth century; though they may have been Low Churchmen, they also held a high view of the duty of saving individuals by preaching the gospel of Christ Crucified.

(4) A small group led by Dr. Arnold of Rugby who desired a Church of England including all English Christians except Roman Catholics and thorough-going Unitarians, a Church which would be strong enough to consecrate every honourable activity in the nation's life; from Arnold is traced the group afterwards known as 'Broad-Church.'

(5) The small group at Oxford led by Keble, Newman and Pusey which developed into a new High-Church party now known as Anglo-Catholic.

All parties then worshipped alike in a way that would now be thought long and tedious, and there were no differences of ritual to arouse fury.

Charles Simeon belonged to the Evangelical party within the Established Church which, like the Methodist Churches outside, had been inspired by the preaching and example of John Wesley. Simeon was born in 1759, went in due course to Eton and King's College, Cambridge, and became a Fellow of that foundation in 1782; in the same year he was appointed to the very poorly paid living of Holy Trinity, Cambridge, and held both offices till his death in 1836. In the early days of his ministry he made friends with John Wesley; he himself was the outstanding leader of the second generation of the Evangelical party and he lived into the third generation represented by such men as Bishop Sumner of Winchester (d. 1874) and Lord Shaftesbury (d. 1885), the latter of whom survived into the lifetime of many of us who are here. For ten years Simeon was harassed and persecuted at Trinity Church, Cambridge, by

churchwardens and other church members who disliked an Evangelical vicar; but he overcame his enemies and for the last thirty years of his life he was the dominant religious force in Cambridge with an influence far beyond that town and University.

When there was less communication between England and Scotland than there is now, Simeon frequently preached and communicated in the Established (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland on the ground that its position in Scotland was the same as that of the Episcopal Established Church in England and that 'where the King must attend a clergyman may preach.' Further, in order to secure a place for Evangelical clergy in the Church of England he acquired the patronage of many livings (now about 150) which is still administered by the Simeon Trustees; consequently a Protestant and Evangelical ministry is secured for the mother churches of such places as Bath, Clifton, Cheltenham and Beverley.

Simeon and the Evangelical party of that day have been criticised on the ground that they emphasized the death of Christ to the neglect of His life and teaching; that in their zeal for saving individuals they forgot the social or corporate aspect of a Christian Church; that they were indifferent to art or science or indeed to any kind of learning apart from Evangelical preaching. All this may be true, but the Evangelicals made religion real to countless individuals, and their influence can be seen in the more serious tone of society and in the many philanthropic movements that marked the first fifty years of the nineteenth century. Testimony to Charles Simeon is borne by Lord Macaulay, who was not an Evangelical though he was a Low Churchman. He says, 'If you knew what his influence and authority were, and how they extended from Cambridge to the most remote corners of England, you would allow that his real sway in the Church was far greater than that of any Primate' (Macaulay *Life*, Vol. I, p. 70).

Like most other English Christians at that time Simeon accepted the Infallibility of the Bible and the prospect of Eternal Punishment for those who refused the Gospel. In 1864 the Privy Council held that those two doctrines are *not* imposed by the formulae of the Established Church on its ministers, and to-day the majority of members of our Church have given them

up. Some of the Evangelical party still insist on a verbally inspired Bible and hold aloof from all who cannot accept that belief; a much larger number, represented for instance by the annual convention at Cromer and by the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, consider that a critical view of the Bible in no way weakens the appeal of the Gospel of Christ, and they also welcome in worship an amount of music and ritual that no party would have suggested a century ago. So far as I can see, both the 'conservative' and the 'liberal' types of Evangelicalism are recognized by those who administer the patronage of the livings in the gift of the Simeon Trustees.

This commemoration suggests a practical question for all members of the Church of England who call themselves Protestant and would resent 'High Church ways' being introduced into the church where they worship. As protest against the view of someone else is not a foundation for one's own religion, we should all ask ourselves where we stand. We can be analysed thus:

(1) Low Churchmen who value the Church of England for themselves but do not wish to impose it on those who prefer other forms of organized Christianity; they recognize ministers as teachers, leaders in worship, and pastors; they observe the sacrament without making it the centre of their religion; they dislike enthusiasm or extravagance; they are tempted to oppose new ventures and to be content if only one's own congregation is tolerable.

(2) Evangelicals who still burn with zeal for saving souls at home and abroad; sometimes they are tempted to be narrow-minded and to distrust all who cannot repeat their phraseology.

(3) Broad Churchmen, like Dr. Arnold, who value a comprehensive national Church as an educative force making for social righteousness; they accept Biblical criticism, desire inter-communion with other Reformed Churches, and probably accept the creed much as it stands; perhaps they may be tempted to ignore theology and concentrate too much on a 'social gospel.'

(4) 'Modernists' who under pressure of modern scientific method demand a wider liberty in the interpretation of creeds;

sometimes, but by no means always, they are tempted to forget that we need not only a philosophy but a Gospel.

Each group might avoid its own temptation if it saw more of the others; and I note that many Evangelicals now prefix the word 'Liberal' and some Low Churchmen prefer to be called 'Broad-low.'

These four groups would probably glory in the title of PROTESTANTS; if they could all work together they would then have to consider their attitude towards the High Church or Anglo-Catholic party that has resulted from the Oxford Movement that began in 1833.

Some on both sides of the dividing line would say that though neither party can turn the other out, the two can never work or worship together and that they must fight for the control of parishes as political parties fight for seats. Protestant members of the Church of England indeed have cause for alarm, suspicion and hostility; yet from my own experience I submit that on both sides many do not desire a permanent feud between Protestants and Anglo-Catholics, neither of whom can either convert or eject the other. When Christianity itself is being attacked, war between two sections of the same communion is deplorable; in this case I maintain that it is also unnecessary.

After all Charles Simeon won his influence because he had a gospel which gave to many individuals peace of mind and an ideal worthy of their best efforts. Whether we call ourselves Evangelical or not, we ought to be agreed that the Gospel of Christ is Good News about God, Ourselves, and the meaning of Life. Having agreed on such a gospel, we ought to be able to differ about the ministry or the sacraments or ritual in worship; and a large amount of variety in such matters is both by history and law permitted in the Established Church of England, of which Charles Simeon was not only an influential but a loyal member and minister.

BOOK REVIEWS

CONGREGATIONALIST LITURGIOLOGY*

On a rough estimate *Christian Worship* is about a quarter the length of *Liturgy and Worship*, the corresponding exposition of High Anglicanism. Yet, in spite of its comparative brevity, it covers a vast field, some of the fifteen essays being marvels of condensed erudition—too condensed, in fact, for rapid reading. The volume marks the Jubilee of Mansfield College, considered as dating from 1886, when 'Andrew Martin Fairbairn came to Oxford and began his teaching' (p. vii). It is dedicated in elegant Latin to Dr. Selbie, in which he is reminded,

> '*tu primus Independentium in hac Universitate vicecancellarium disertissimum et facundissimum Johannem Owen ex aede Christi longo intervallo secutus vestimenta doctoris in sacrosancta theologia induisti*' —John Owen, the Puritan divine 'ejected' from the Church of England in 1662 (p. 226).

The book, as a whole, is an historically based apologia of Independent or Congregationalist principles and ideals of worship, in spite of the inclusion among its contributors of Dr. Wheeler Robinson, Principal of the Baptist College of Regent's Park.

It opens with a fine dissertation from the pen of Dr. Garvie on 'the Philosophy of Worship,' in which he pleads for the development of worship in the light of developing theology and ethics,

> 'so that creed and code may always "make one music" with ritual, "and vaster" as man's thoughts of God widen and his standards of life are raised' (p. 8).

All who are concerned with liturgical reform and the improvement of worship, whatever their denomination or ecclesiastical colour, should read and ponder on this expression of the ripe fruit of religious philosophy, which seems to transcend the differences between Catholic and Protestant, Sacramentalist and Evangelical, Traditionalist and Modernist.

Then follow four 'Biblical Studies'—the first on Old Testament worship by Dr. Wheeler Robinson, a wide and sympathetic appreciation of Hebrew piety, with its various tensions, between the priestly and the prophetic attitudes, between the nationalistic and the universalistic outlooks, between this-worldly interest and other-worldly aspiration; the second a very able presentation of 'The Jewish Background' of the Gospel by Dr. T. W. Manson; the third on 'The Word of God in the New Testament' by Dr. W. H. Cadman, concluding with the pregnant remark, 'Christian worship is at once the Word of God and the obedient response thereto' (p. 67); the fourth on 'The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper' by Dr. H. H. Dodd. This last culminates in a very significant statement of the doctrine in almost Catholic terms. He distinguishes three aspects: remembrance, communion, and sacrifice. 'The Sacrament unites us with Christ in His sacrifice,' and thus becomes worship. For 'worship at its highest involves a sacrifice, or dedication of the self' (p. 82).

Next we have six historical articles. The first is a very packed survey of the earliest liturgies by Dr. Vernon Bartlet; the second, a similar one on

* *Christian Worship. Studies in its History and Meaning.* By Members of Mansfield College. Edited by Nathaniel Micklem. (Oxford University Press. 1936. 12/6.)

'Christian Worship in the Middle Ages' by Dr. R. S. Franks. Then come three very readable dissertations on the three protagonists of Protestantism — Luther, Zwingli, Calvin — by Dr. Moffat, Dr. Cadoux, and Mr. J. S. Whale. Dr. Cadoux contends that Zwingli was no Zwinglian, since

> 'in all Zwingli wrote about the Supper the question of Christ's *spiritual* presence with His worshippers was never in dispute' (p. 150).

Then Mr. A. G. Matthews contributes a delightful sketch of Puritan methods of prayer and religious observance generally. He writes that

> 'there is something amateurish about Puritan attempts [in their literature of religious devotion], a deficiency explicable in part by the forms in which they expressed their spiritual needs, explicable further by the ecclesiastical cleavage which cut them off from the sifted experience of Catholic piety' (p. 18)

—a noteworthy admission from a Nonconformist.

The four concluding 'Contemporary Studies' set forth well-considered judgments on the essentials of worship — on prayer and thanksgiving and adoration, together with hymnody and preaching, and on the Sacraments. Dr. E. R. Micklem in 'Psychological Considerations' discusses the advantages and drawbacks of extempore prayer, as, on the one hand, giving an impression of spontaneity and reality, and, on the other, of being difficult for the congregation to enter into, being like 'an exercise in "unseens"' (p. 199). Mr. K. L. Parry, however, is more inclined to stress its advantages. 'It is a great gift to be able to lead a congregation in prayer,' there being only two fundamental conditions: 'the minister must know his people and be one with them in all their cares and joys, and he must know God' (p. 235). In a stimulating essay on 'The preaching of the Word' Mr. E. Shillito asserts and testifies to the convincing and converting power of the preacher, who receiving a revelation from God is commissioned to declare it. One might desiderate something on the function of silence in worship, corresponding to the article by Dr. Charles Harris in *Liturgy and Worship* entitled 'Liturgical Silence'—such as practised among the Friends.

The last essay is by Principal Nathaniel Micklem of Mansfield College, on 'The Sacraments.' He expands the Protestant doctrine of Sacraments as 'modes of the Word,' elaborating it under seven headings and applying it severally to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, with copious references to Calvin. The question whether Sacraments are necessary he answers by saying that 'they are necessary for the Church, but not necessary for individual salvation' (p. 246). One wonders how far he would accept Dr. Dodd's theory of the Lord's Supper alluded to above.

One of the most urgent of modern needs is the reform and development of public worship. While admitting to the full what contributors to *Liturgy and Worship* have to say on the beauty and nobility of the Book of Common Prayer, we should welcome the maintenance by writers in *Christian Worship* of the right and obligation to freedom of expression and sincerity in our religious services. As Dr. Garvie well says:

> 'There seems to-day, when religious thought has undergone so far-reaching a transformation, an imperative need for making our modes of worship such that it can be said to be "in spirit and in truth." Sincerity and reality should not be sacrificed to continuity and conformity' (p. 7).

Perhaps a really adequate revision of the Prayer Book—a rewriting that will make it truly expressive of the more instructed and ampler and aspiring

faith and devotion surging in the more ardent spirits of the modern world — waits upon the reunion of the Church of England with those religious bodies which, because of controversies now nearly obsolete, have from time to time emerged and broken away from her. This volume of essays, it is to be hoped, will help greatly towards both that reunion and that rewriting.

FREDERICK A. M. SPENCER.

CRITICISM AND CHRISTOLOGY*

Although this is a very small book consisting of the lectures given by Dr. Dibelius in King's College, London, it tells more clearly than any other, certainly any small book, what the 'Formgeschichtliche Methode' is. For this reason alone it is to be strongly recommended to those who feel unable to cope with the author's important 'From Tradition to Gospel' or with Dr. Taylor's 'The Formation of the Gospel Tradition.' But its value does not end here; indeed, this is but a part of the book; the real aim is to discuss the vitally important question of Christology in relation to this new method of New Testament criticism. This is done with amazing clarity and fullness in the small compass of 104 pages.

From many, the conclusions of Dr. Dibelius will draw a sigh of relief— it might be malicious to add that some will be disappointed — since he by no means denies a historical substratum to the Gospels. He argues that just because the Gospels are composed of 'Paradyms,' 'Tales,' and 'Legends' without chronology, we can be assured of an underlying historical genuineness.

> 'If the tradition were of a later origin, it would have been shaped differently; presumably . . . in a form much nearer to our expectations, outwardly far more "historical" in the general sense of the term.'

It may be that any kind of chronological order in *Mark* is denied a little too easily here (p. 68).

The first lecture, under the heading 'The Dilemma: Jesus or Christ?' deals with the two modern schools of New Testament criticism. The one is Radical Idealism represented in Germany by Drews; we associate it with the name of Loisy. It is Catholic Modernism. The author's conviction that the Gospels contain real history severs him from this school, whose importance he deems is chiefly to be seen in its revelation of the weakness of the position of the other school, that of the Leben-Jesu-Theologie, the 'radical historians,' the Liberal Protestants. These latter provide the author with a starting point for his description of the 'Form-critical Method' (ch. 2). He shows that Gospels are not history books nor biographies as such at all:

> 'Those early Christians were not interested in history . . . they were not interested in biography; in other words, they did not ask primarily what Jesus looked like, how old he was, what journeys he made, or how long the ministry lasted';

they asked of the good-tidings. We note, however, that the list of their non-interests is selected, and we may be so far in complete agreement, but without this selection the statement that they were not interested in history might be too strong. The 'good-tidings' were in some historical frame. With this no doubt Dr. Dibelius would agree.

* *Gospel Criticism and Christology*. By Martin Dibelius. (Nicholson & Watson. 1935. Price 4/6.)

Chapter 3 shows clearly the Christological trend of tradition; even the earliest pericopae, the 'Paradyms,' are Christological in intent:

'they seek to show that this Jesus is the Risen Lord of the Church.'

There is nothing new here, but the facts are set out with wonderful clarity. Chapter 4 is possibly the most important. It asks the question, 'Have we any real history in the Gospels at all — any real biographical material?' The answer of the author is in the affirmative. The earliest matter, the 'Paradyms,' 'contain practically no biographical material, properly so called,' but 'the evangelists have added a good deal of biographical material.' Luke is 'the author *par excellence* among the evangelists' (in the previous chapter the argument is stated for this, 'Luke thinks in terms of biography, John in terms of Christology'). There are some excellent observations here upon miracle:

> 'A miracle, for those who lived in the ancient world, is that event in which the hand of God could be clearly traced.'

The title of the book is taken from the last chapter, 'Gospel Criticism and Christology.'

> 'The New Testament then is concerned not with the nature of Christ but with the work of Christ, with the fact of revelation.'

This is true, but it must be added that the Christology of the New Testament, or rather the Christologies, are attempts not only to set the revelation to work in the world, but also to account for the 'work' by that 'nature.' It is misleading to call St. Paul a 'theologian,' even a Jewish theologian. Paul was first a missionary, an extraordinarily busy missionary, whose thought-forms were cast in Jewish mould. This, however, does not make much difference to the author's point.

The book ends with a return to the 'Leben-Jesu-Theologie' School:

> 'This school committed the error of thinking that historical data could satisfy the claims of faith.' 'The significance which attaches to the life of Jesus and the events connected with it becomes evident only if we see in the Gospel more than a historical account.'

Yet so far from abandoning history,

> 'it is possible to speak of the foundation of the Christian Church by a man from Galilee who lived in the reign of Tiberius Caesar. . . . Neither the cult of Mithras nor the cult of Serapis could lay claim to historic origin.'

This is a small book, but it is of importance out of all proportion to its size.

J. R. C. Webb.

TRANSCENDENCE*

The thought of Barth and his school has shaken the theology of our time; the dominant theme of that thought is that of the transcendence of God. In his *God Transcendent* Professor Heim offers a rationale of Barth's sometimes dim divinings; in his *Spirit and Truth* he pursues their major implications for life. The importance of both attempts for modern theology can hardly be exaggerated. The reality which that emphasis upon immanence, which was the major contribution of nineteenth century thought, reveals, is not seriously in dispute to-day; the reality of transcendence waits to be re-established.

* *God Transcendent.* By Karl Heim. (Nisbet. 1935. Price 10/-.)
Spirit and Truth. By Karl Heim. (Lutterworth Press. 1935. Price 6/-.)

It is this primary task which Professor Heim essays.

> 'What is the truth about the transcendence of God,' he asks, 'and how is that transcendence different from any transcendence within the sphere of this world?' 'How is it that we who live in the Copernican age—we for whom the world has lost its centre and its bounds—can still hold to the idea of the Transcendent?'

In other words, how can the twentieth century believe in God?

Professor Heim deploys the troops of his apologetic upon a new front, seeking for the mortal type of the transcendence which he defends, not in physics but in psychology, and defends his analogy, not with prophetic affirmation, but with, for the most part, a quiet and careful pursuit of the inductive method.

Transcendence implies boundary, and he delimits his problem by differentiating between the 'boundary of content' dividing 'quantitatively limited magnitudes within a space,' and the 'boundary of dimension' which divides 'two infinitudes,' 'two magnitudes which have neither beginning nor end.'

Amongst other phenomena of our existential experience in support of such a distinction, that of a three-fold world of consciousness, with its 'dimensions' of 'I,' 'Thou' and 'It,' divided by boundaries, not of content (since they evidently co-exist), but of dimension, is made a foundation-stone of this new apologetic and the 'intra-mundane' a type of an extra-mundane transcendence. This type of transcendence is not only dimensional, but also 'will permit of description only in paradox.' It contains, moreover, a further significance for religious thought in that the mutual recognition of such 'infinite manifolds' implies a 'place of meeting,' and, upon examination, this 'place of meeting' is seen to be the 'Word' by means of which alone 'the Other and His consciousness-world is disclosed to me.'

Again, this 'Word' of revelation 'can only take place between two persons when they are in action.' Thus contact between two such consciousness-worlds requires a 'Word,' and a 'Word' requires action and is born of decision.

Theology is thus furnished with a temporal type of transcendence compatible with modern knowledge, a transcendence which is dimensional, which postulates a 'meeting-place' in a 'Word' and is only knowable through action and decision. Here is, in fact, a new 'analogy of religion.' It is an analogy the consonance of which with much modern thought is immediately evident. Its appeal is made to and its type taken from, not physical, but psychological experience, and is consonant, not with a Newtonian, but with an Einsteinian cosmology. In the light of it, Professor Whitehead's saying that peace involves 'a grasp of infinitudes, an appeal beyond boundaries,' or Przywara's definition of divine transcendence as 'lying behind consciousness,' find a new significance for religious thought.

For just so the 'I'-consciousness lies beyond the 'Thou'-consciousness. Why not, then, a divine transcendence which, in its turn, lies beyond both 'I' and 'Thou' and, indeed, the entire consciousness of our mundane world? And if, in the human 'word' which reveals a new world to the 'I'-consciousness, contact between two mutually transcendent worlds is established, why should not the 'wholly other' world of the 'Kingdom of God' have been revealed, just so, in the 'Word' Who was Christ?

The majestic pyramid of Christian theology is thus based upon, in the words of St. Augustine, *'ista et usitata et abdita'* of our common experience; the mystery and paradox of Christianity are once more conceivable for the modern mind. Whether or not they are credible is evidently contin-

gent upon certain postulates which Professor Heim assumes, but which it will be for the theology of the future to examine and test.

In the first place, we have evidently to ask ourselves whether the 'existential judgement,' a judgement not, to quote Professor Heim, 'from the standpoint of a mere spectator, but only on the ground of my total existence,' which thus affirms both the existence and the transcendence of such intra-mundane infinitudes as the 'I' and the 'Thou' worlds of consciousness, is a judgement valid for such an issue. And, in the second place, we must enquire whether the transference of the type of transcendence which such judgement affirms in the intra-mundane sphere can justifiably be made to an extra-mundane sphere by valid analogy.

Moreover it is to be observed that while Professor Heim is content to assume that the 'place of meeting' between such consciousness-worlds in the 'Word' of human speech is a valid analogy for the Logos-doctrine of Christianity, it is evident that this involves an act of faith. Failing other support for such an analogy, such a 'Word' is not necessarily or in itself proof of the reality of the incarnate Christ; the analogy as equally applicable to a 'Wisdom'-faith or Gnosticism for which the 'Word' has never finally or fully been 'made flesh.'

Such strictures are made only to mark the evident fact that the work of Professor Heim does not pretend to cover the ground of a full '*dogmatik*' or metaphysic, that it makes certain assumptions which all religious faith must make, and that it leaves a vast area to be explored. They do not, in any way, diminish the high value of the re-orientation of Christian thought which he suggests.

Professor Heim assumes the postulates which have been noted, and proceeds, in '*obiter dicta*' in his *God Transcendent,* and more deliberately and exhaustively in his *Spirit and Truth,* to elaborate the implications of a doctrine of divine transcendence which such an analogy suggests.

It seems, on the one hand, to buttress the Barthian theology and, on the other, to negate the pure doctrine of evolutionism. The characteristic dicta of Professor Barth take on a new relevance to life in the light of it. '. . . two planes intersect, the one known and the other unknown; just so the plane of the 'I'-consciousness intersects the plane of the 'Thou'-consciousness.' 'The truth has encountered us from beyond a frontier which we have never crossed'; the truth which is true for our neighbour is encountered by us across a frontier no less apparently impassable.

Again, in contra-distinction to evolutionism, if, on the analogy of the 'otherness' of the 'I' and the 'Thou,' the 'otherness' of God is again a factor to be reckoned with in life, we are once again concerned with a supreme force other than the evolution of 'intra-mundane' consciousness. 'It may quite well be that our task is the hard one of swimming against the current of evolution as it has hitherto flowed.' Judging by the latest eddies of that turbid stream, it seems probable enough that the task of swimming against it is overdue.

This new analogy of religion seems also to provide a rational critique of more extreme Catholicism and to suggest a re-vitalized Protestantism. Professor Heim is not alone in perceiving in the 'giant organism of the Roman Church' a 'molten core' of the 'mystical eros of Plotinus,' an affirmation of human 'ecstasy' suggesting a hidden humanism in which the Church is not, at heart, 'other' than the world.

Professor Anders Nygren has differentiated 'Agape' as 'the downward movement of the self-giving Divine love' and 'Eros' as the 'upward movement of the human soul to seek the Divine.' There would seem to be some

justification for suspecting with Professor Heim, that the Roman system, with its emphasis upon beatification, is a cultivation of the 'upward movement' of the human soul in 'Eros.'

For a faith founded upon such an analogy as that which Professor Heim elaborates, the plane of 'Agape,' of an extra-mundane Love co-existing with and yet 'other' than our intra-mundane and 'erotic' consciousness, and intersecting it, becomes plainly of a more transcendent importance than the system of catholic piety would seem to suggest. A faith which accepts the 'Agape' plane as truly transcendent 'cannot find God through a state of ecstasy.' For such a faith, for which the 'place of meeting' in the 'Word' is the heart of religion, 'we can find only in profound solitude and complete lucidity of mind.'

Whether the antinomy thus posed is as final as Professor Heim suggests, whether a valid distinction cannot be drawn between an earth and a heaven-induced ecstasy, whether the approach of the Catholic Church towards religious reality is as exclusively or as radically 'erotic' as Professors Heim and Nygren suggest, it seems clear that here is, for the modern consciousness, the real dividing line between the Catholic and the Evangelical approach, the opposite poles of the religious consciousness. For a religion which begins and ends in solitude is very other than the religion of Rome. The Protestant counter-case to Rome seems thus to be placed upon a new and firmer footing.

When we examine Professor Heim's second pre-requisite of faith, however, the necessity for 'lucidity of mind,' we seem to encounter a confusion which suggests that the foundations of this theology are still insecure and a trend of thought which, if pursued to a logical issue, leads, not only from Rome, but towards a rationalism far removed from religion.

For we are told that 'we are able to reach God only when our *minds* are lucid and clear,' that 'we can find God only . . . in profound solitude and lucidity of *mind*.' (The italics are the reviewer's.)

If such dicta — and there are many to this effect — are to be taken at their face value, it would seem to be clearly suggested that this 'solitary, spiritual act' is equivalent to intellectual apprehension. That Professor Heim is far from allying himself to the rationalism which such language suggests seems to be sufficiently evidenced by a further pronouncement which has the appearance of a complete *volte face*. 'Where God does not choose to make Himself known,' he says, 'all philosophical argument is a vain attempt to fly over the frontier' — a dictum which it is not easy to reconcile with those quoted above.

In point of fact, the bracketting of this 'spiritual act' with 'minds' which are 'lucid and clear' seems to betray a radical confusion of thought, and the apparent emphasis upon reason is far from being an inevitable conclusion from the analogy which Professor Heim expounds. It would seem, in fact, to be contrary to it. For the 'existential judgement' upon which this analogy has been said to depend, is by no means a solely rational or intellectual judgement; it is rather the judgement of the 'whole man' in action. And that judgment, if any term can fully express that mysterious act, is that, not of his intellect alone, but of his 'spirit.'

The prime necessity for the examination, assessment and definition of 'existential thinking' is thus made more cogent by the confusion into which Professor Heim seems to have fallen at this point.

But that confusion invalidates neither the analogy which he has so significantly made nor the essential line of demarcation between the Catholic and Evangelical poles of religion which he has drawn. Given his

postulates and subject to the provisos which have been noted, his 'new analogy' seems to justify the conception of a re-established Evangelical Church, a Church of the Word or Spirit, which he advocates so passionately in the conclusion to the more polemical work under review.

That conception — one, it seems, peculiarly congenial to the English temperament—will appear to many to-day to be the only effective antidote to the secularism which invades our world apace or to the obscurantism which opposes it. It can only be truly founded upon that doctrine of transcendence which Professor Heim has striven to reconstitute, '. . . . a more profound "beyond," an idea of transcendence which has nothing to do with spatial distance, a divine word which, like the atmosphere, surrounds us invisibly on every side.'

M. Chaning Pearce.

AMONG THE VICTORIANS *

A book of over five hundred pages, unless it be of the rarest excellence, is bound to provoke the exclamation: '*μέγα βίβλιον μέγα κακόν.*' It is not, however, to be understood by this that Dr. Elliott-Binns, whose reputation and achievements are well able to withstand a reviewer's occasional captiousness, has wasted words in his encyclopaedic accumulation of information about religion during the greater part of the nineteenth century. It is difficult to discover any movement or important personality that has escaped mention, and the term 'religion' is very broadly taken, so that the whole field of social conditions, education, philosophical and scientific thought and political development comes under review in addition to the fortunes of ecclesiastical parties and theological opinions.

To understand the book it is necessary to refer to the author's own account of how and from what angle he came to write it.

> 'There is hardly a biography of any prominent figure of the last century, in the ecclesiastical sphere at least, which I have not read . . . The lives of the great men and women of the past century, and of many who were by no means deserving of the epithet, have been my chief authorities. And because I have had to deal with many minds and many diverse points of view, seeking fairness I have left them, in not a few cases, to use their own words.'

His work has, in fact, the strength and weakness of a book inspired by biographical interest and constructed largely on biographical lines.

There is much of profit, refreshment and entertainment in this account of a difficult and complex period of religious history. The book contains a great deal of information which is new to the ordinary lay reader, even if he be a student of history. Something of the rich confusion of contemporary actuality is preserved. The reader lives among the personalities of an age which, though recent, is remote from the present generation; and that is no mean thing for an author to achieve, even though he himself belongs to the older generation. Our historical perspective is frequently refreshed and our imagination enlivened; and from such varied biographical resources comes a wealth of entertaining and always relevant anecdotes and humorous touches, sometimes lurking in footnotes, such as Monckton Miles remark that

> 'people did not mind Tennyson's printing "god" with a small letter since he kept the capital for "Squire."'

* *Religion in the Victorian Era.* L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D. (Lutterworth Press. 1936. 15/-.)

And it must be noted to the author's credit that he keeps his presentation surprisingly free from party bias.

The fact remains that the whole book is anecdotal rather than critical—a compendium of incidents rather than an essay of interpretation. There is apparently no synthetic organization of the material to illustrate some key thesis as to the place of religion in history or any other general proposition. Perhaps the philosophical standpoint of which the absence is here lamented is too impersonal a thing to be compatible with the biographical approach. Yet it is hard to see in what way accumulation avails without interpretation, even if the accumulation were so exhaustive as to result in one of those standard works which are admired by all and read by none.

There is, at the end of the book, an interesting summary of the mental and moral characteristics of the period under review, in which Victorian England is seen in terms of a tension between the desire for freedom and the necessity of organization. But there is no synthetic treatment throughout the book. For example, the chapter on 'Religion and Science' is followed by one on 'Religion and History' wherein Buckle's work is dismissed in a phrase ('Buckle . . . tried to reduce history to a scientific system'), and a longish paragraph is devoted to William Stubbs' youthful experiences. There is no attempt to relate the 'scientific' treatment of history to the scientific movement generally, nor to discover the effects of scientific development upon the intellectual climate of our own day. There is on p. 88 a hint of the modern tendency to put too much faith in mere knowledge as a means of inaugurating the Kingdom of Heaven, echoed by a quotation from Mr. Christopher Dawson on p. 248, but this line is not followed up. Again, in the treatment of the Oxford Movement, there is no clear relation of that movement to the Reform Bill of 1832 and to the European Revolutions. The Churchmen who could tolerate subjection to government while government rested in Tory hands grew anxious when Radicals and Dissenters came into power, and Newman wrote: 'The vital question was, how were we to keep the Church from being liberalised?' On the European situation Newman wrote these words of strangely antique flavour:

> 'The Bourbons had been dismissed, and I believed it was un-Christian for nations to cast off their governments and, much more, sovereigns who had the divine right of inheritance.'

Any historian of religion in the Victorian era is confronted by a challenge on ultimate facts and beliefs which Dr. Elliott-Binns does not choose to take up in the present book. Although he observes (p. 500) that 'beneath all the naïve optimism of the era there was always an undertone of pessimism: of apprehension in face of the unknown,' and although he suspects (p. 508) that the whole age of liberal humanism which the Renaissance inaugurated is drawing to a close, he does not focus the whole of his material upon the problem of interpreting the fundamental dynamics of history. On pp. 247-8 the author makes important observations as to the relation between material and spiritual aims and motives in the reform of social abuses; yet he refrains from going to the heart of the matter, as is apparent from the fact that the ensuing pages contain more about the Temperance Movement than about Karl Marx. Thus the main problem for our generation does not clearly emerge. The old, easy liberalism is obsolete. So, for all practical purposes, is a religion which does not avail for social and economic reform. The question is whether there is anything to be hoped from a movement for social redemption which denies or ignores

God and the spirtual life. The view that religion is merely epiphenomenal, and that theologies and moralities are the expression of economic interests, is seriously held and plausibly argued to-day in some quarters. This kind of challenge is one to which the historian of religion might be expected to respond, especially at a time when the nature and functions of the State are being seriously reviewed from a Christian standpoint, by Dr. J. H. Oldham and others, under the stimulus of the challenge of Totalitarianism to Liberal Democracy. Doubtless it is impossible to prove, by appeal to history, the truth or falsehood of religious beliefs. But it should at least be possible to present a religious interpretation of history which, in coherence, comprehensiveness and effectiveness, yields nothing to the godless historical philosophies of our day. It may be that this was deliberately excluded from Dr. Elliott-Binns' purpose. To which the only retort is the hope that some historian of comparable ability and repute will make it his purpose.

M. V. C. Jeffreys.

ST. PAUL*

There are so many short books on St. Paul that a new one, to justify itself, ought to have something fresh to contribute. The only new thing about the present book is its arrangement. Sixty pages are devoted to the Life of Paul; eighty to the Teaching; and the remaining one hundred and twenty pages of the book are taken up with Selected Extracts from the Acts and the Epistles. This arrangement seems to have been done in imitation of the many little books containing Lives of poets and a selection of their writings; but it is without the same justification. For one thing, there is not such a bulk of Pauline writings as to deter even the most faint-hearted student from reading them through. For another thing, Paul on the whole does not gain by being 'selected.' Most readers, it is safe to say, will find the extracts less interesting and less easy to understand than a whole Epistle. Finally, and fatally, in spite of the extracts, amounting to nearly half the book, the volume is not self-contained. It is impossible to understand the text without looking up the references, and by no means all the references are available in the selected passages.

The account of the Life follows familiar and conventional lines: the account of the Teaching reads rather like note-book material. Disconnected articles deal with Sin; Faith; The Church; Man, and so on. Coming from Dr. Anderson Scott, these little essays are full of interest for the student of Paul, but they are too condensed to be of much value to the general reader, who, we venture to think, would gain much more from Dr. Anderson Scott's larger book than from this, which is presumably supposed to have a wider appeal. The incidental translation of Pauline phrases into modern English idiom is often arresting and illuminating; but, 'At present my knowledge is fragmentary' does not seem to add much to 'Now I know in part,' and it certainly takes a great deal away.

R. J. Stanford.

FROM AMOS TO JONAH†

The popular term in religious parlance of to-day appears to be 'relevance,' and one is sorely tempted to ask of any religious book which attempts in a simple way to expound the results of theological research:

* *St. Paul, the Man and the Teacher.* C. A. Anderson Scott. (Cambridge University Press. 1936. 5/-.)

† *The Prophets of the Bible.* By Henry Cook. (S.C.M. Press. 1935. 5/-.)

Is it relevant? In other words: Do its contents bear any vital relation to life as we have to live it? This question is not unfair in the consideration of such a book as Mr. Cook's, for here we have a straightforward objective study of the Old Testament Prophets, their personal characteristics, their literary methods, their specific message, together with some account of the historical background of their thought.

A general Introduction deals in an enlightened way with Prophecy in its relation to Prediction and to Inspiration. The limitations of the Prophets are admitted—the mistakes they made, their mutual contradictions and so forth. Yet in spite of human frailty they are to be regarded as the mouthpiece of God's Holy Spirit: taken by and large their message is the gradual unfolding of the express will of God, in terms which transcend local and temporary conditions. There is then the tacit assumption that some certain authority is here, but the reader is left to think out for himself the relevance of the revelation. Mr. Cook is content to give as his reason for writing the book the fact that he has 'found the prophets a constant source of pleasure and inspiration.' A very good reason, but may we not ask if it is a sufficient comprehensive reason? The timeless quality of the prophets' message surely demands that it should be constantly re-interpreted and related to existing conditions if it is to have any clear value of its own. Admittedly it is not the purpose of our book to do this, but we suggest that the work would be more to the point if it were. It is most important that we should know what the message of the prophets is, and this Mr. Cook is able to tell us most excellently, but we would welcome another volume from his easy pen showing more clearly how these somewhat remote Hebrews can speak to us to-day. Can their conceptions of God and His mode of working, for example, be paralleled to any extent in modern life? Would Mr. Cook yet identify any present-day group as a Deutero-Isaianic Servant? Would he see in any European leader a modern Cyrus, unwittingly anointed to direct the new Israel back to the true God? He probably would and we should like him to say so.

Mr. Cook has given us a very readable, and at the same time a scholarly introduction to the study of the Old Testament Prophets. The book is divided according to the three historical periods: Pre-exilic, Exilic and Post-exilic, and each section has its own Introduction. As far as is possible the prophecies are placed in chronological order, their essential features clearly defined, and related both to contemporary events, and internally to the sequence of prophetic insight. The object of the book is attained with honours, yet one cannot suppress the thought that that object might have been a little more 'relevant' to our times.

G. F. Cope.

BLACK MAN'S BURDEN *

Dr. Monica Hunter has written a great book. In it she records the life of the Pondoland native to-day. It is a double task. The majority of the Pondolanders still live in their 'natural' conditions, less influenced by Europeans than any other South African tribe. On the other hand, a proportion of the people are town-dwellers in East London, while others, in increasing numbers, seek work on European farms, and in factory and mine.

> 'Johannesburg,' writes General Smuts, 'with its glittering prizes (on native standards) has become a sort of Mecca.'

* *Reaction to Conquest.* By Monica Hunter, M.A., Ph.D. With an Introduction by General the Rt. Hon. J. C. Smuts. (Published for the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures by the Oxford University Press. 1936. Price 30/-.)

A study of Pondo life divides, then, into two fairly distinguishable parts: a study of the primitive native, and a study of the effect upon him of European industrialism, religion and manners. Natives of the same mentality and customs may be observed under both conditions, and natives of the same generation, so that Pondoland offers many advantages to the scientific investigator. Dr. Hunter's book is both a fascinating contribution to anthropology and a handbook, dreadful and challenging, for the coloniser and missionary.

Dr. Hunter brings to her formidable task gifts of the highest scientific order; a personality, plain in these pages, profound and warm, and, as important, an intimate knowledge since childhood of the Bantu of the Pondoland. She was brought up at Loveday, a native educational centre, and has studied anthropology, while at Girton, under Dr. Hodson. She is both scientist and woman, and never does the one oust the other. Indeed, her womanly sympathies have lent her an insight into tribal life unmatched elsewhere, to the reviewer's knowledge, while her feminine patience and care for detail, her unflagging interest in the domestic *minutiae* which make up most of life, enhance the scientific value of her work. The greater part of the book is a detached record, without comment, of things heard and seen in hut, kraal and field, and in the two locations in East London wherein the Bantu is compulsorily segregated. Under the headings 'Family Life,' 'Economic Organisation,' 'Growing Up,' 'Witchcraft and Magic,' etc., record follows record, even dryly, after the photographic style of Sir James Frazer's *Fear of the Dead*. Strangely, the cumulative effect is on the imagination of the reader who, as he gets into the book, begins to live with this primitive folk. Yet the scientist can write:

> 'My (native) clerk always retorted with an oration on my education, which mollified the critics. "Is she really a B.A.? Well, of course, that does make a difference."'

Dr. Hunter's general picture of a primitive people is the familiar one. Taboo mechanistically determines life in all its aspects, yet the Chief exercises great personal power. Magic is all-pervading and often terrible in its demands, though the emotional tone of the community is certainly not fear. Dr. Hunter would agree with Schweitzer that the natural savage is a prey to disease, chiefly because of dirt. The economic life, while it recognizes distinction of rank, is communal in the sense that land ultimately is owned by the tribe, although held by the individual, and this arrangement is largely secured not by the working of Taboo, but by deliberate policy, children being taught to be generous and to regard all food as common. There emerges from these pages a picture of a people on the whole happy and benevolent and, most strikingly, of a society of a beautiful balance. Civilised man, in his competitive moil, as he reads of these people, may well be overcome by that melancholic nostalgia which Melville's *Typee* awakened in him. One recalls Mr. H. M. Tomlinson returning from an up-river Indian village to the S.S. *Capelle* and noting the honey-coloured natives reclining in the shade combing their hair, with the grace of animals. He ironically reflected he once put money into a Church plate in Poplar for these poor savages, and wondered how they dare be so content without the Workhouse and Poor Law which Poplar enjoyed.

The comparative rightness of the primitive sex-life is particularly plain in this book. It has long been recognized that Taboo is sexually centred; Dr. Hunter's peculiar contribution is a patient recording of taboos, about which she herself never generalises, which makes it clear that Taboo centres

especially on the sex-cycle of the woman. The broad effect of Taboo is socially admirable. The young girl and boy are protected, and women always at certain times. It is ensured that relationship resulting in offspring shall, as a rule, be permanent, though the Bantu is polygamous, or at least that the child is provided and cared for. 'Law' runs within the hut, and men and women are equal before it. The lactation taboo allows two years or more between each child-bearing. Concerning the rights of women and the means of securing them the parallel is close between the Pondo code and that of *Exodus,* though it would seem that it is the woman's rights which the Pondolander estimates in terms of property, whereas *Exodus* rather regards the woman herself as the property of the man. A father says to a son-in-law on the wedding-day:

> 'To-day I give to you this child of mine . . . But know this, I do not give this child to you, but lend her. . . (As for your payment that) does not mean you have bought her. 'A person cannot be bought.''

In many details Christian communities might emulate these savages, and in general this book raises acutely the question whether our own sexual morality, developed by the Christian Church largely under celibate influences, is sufficiently realistic or adequate for the demands of man or of God. Admittedly, not all the Pondo customs would be practicable in modern Europe, above all because we are comparatively detached from that life of the instincts which is the ground of Taboo. The strict and humane Bantu morality is made sexually possible by the custom of adolescents of both sexes meeting together every so often for what amount to community 'bundling' parties; by the existence of a class of unattached women, in no sense prostitutes, but made up of girls too independent to marry, unable to find husbands, divorced, or widowed early; and by a worship of children which is careless of their paternity. Clearly the necessary basis for the Pondo manner of life is the economic security which all enjoy. In these matters women are as free, or as bound, as men, and show a remarkable independence of mind. Part of a woman's song runs:

> 'And I said, "I am not the daughter of a white man to be told to do this and that and that.
> 'Even if they give three more head I will never go back to my husband."'

It is almost a relief to find ordinary human weakness in this Arcadia:

> 'A young man came to have the edges of his blanket stitched in the shop. His old one was elegantly embroidered round the edges. He explained it had been done by his *idikazi* (woman friend), but he was afraid to get her to do another because his wife went "wow, wow, wow."'

The change-over from hunting and semi-agriculture to modern agriculture and industry must necessarily be difficult. The shift in the economic foundations disrupts the whole edifice of society. General Smuts agrees with the finding of Dr. Hunter that it is the economic factor which is of paramount importance. The consequences of economic change are directly felt in the cultural and moral spheres.

> 'A Xhosa chief on first seeing a plough at work exclaimed: "This thing that the white people have brought into the country is as good as ten wives."'

In the African Colonies for which the Colonial Office is responsible, and to which it is not Dr. Hunter's business to refer, the present policy is to modify and adapt tribal organization, economic and political, rather than

to abolish it. This system, of 'Indirect Government,' was first worked out in Nigeria, and Civil Servants trained there are now applying it successfully to other parts of Africa. Dr. Hunter presents a very different picture. In Pondoland the inevitable but not insuperable difficulty of the change-over to settled or town conditions is exacerabated and rendered insurmountable by what can only be termed the exploitation of the native for the white man's profit. Dr. Hunter sets down the facts impartially, and her figures speak for themselves. In East London, 20,000 souls, that is, all the Bantu townspeople save domestic servants, are compulsorily segregated in two locations occupying 142 acres. In the larger location, accommodating some 17,000 persons, over 7,000 are housed, usually in iron huts, at three per room. The population of 20,000 is supplied with but 23 street water-taps and 175 latrines, while the street gutter is the domestic drain. Fifteen miles of streets have 17 street-lamps. The infant mortality rate is 332·5 per 1,000, as against 54·05 for the Europeans of the same town. One of the typical household budgets Dr. Hunter has recorded shows two men and one woman, fully employed, the woman as a laundry-hand at 6/- per month, to be earning in all £6 18*s*. per month, which earnings they pool to feed themselves and two others and pay a rent of 18/- per month. The high rentals indicate the character and the rapacity of the exploitation, and may be contrasted with the rents paid to-day by the far from prosperous Berkshire farm labourer, who earns himself about £7 per month and pays 12/- per month for a four-roomed cottage with an allotment attached of one-quarter, or even one-third, of an acre. It is such monstrous conditions as these of East London, in the light of which the cotton-slave of the Southern States was a happy person, that are brutalizing the native; the natural difficulties of change from tribal to town conditions are as nothing compared to the problems exploitation has created.

In Pondoland the missionary has so far made little progress, only ten per cent. of the people being Christian, and these chiefly townsmen. In East London there are 2,080 native Christians fantastically divided between 57 sects. The missionary appears to have dealt too quickly and thoughtlessly with the Bantu sexual code, and premarital pregnancy is much commoner among converts than among pagans. In one of her few general statements Dr. Hunter writes:

> 'That Christianity is in some measure a disintegrating force in a tribal community cannot be denied . . . But at the same time Christian influences assist adaptation to the new conditions produced by economic contacts with Europeans. Those who are best adapting themselves to town life are the Christians and those who have been to school . . . In town the sanctions for behaviour in the tribal community are no longer effective, and the ancestor cult, dependent upon cattle, is weakening. Christianity offers an ethic which may hold in all communities. Apart from the necessity of replacing the tribal ethic with one which is applicable to both phases of modern Pondo life, Christians are compelled to preach their faith in the reserves because they believe that through the power of Christ, and through Him alone, comes a quality of life which is an ultimate value in itself.'

But the book is little concerned with Christianity, and it is indeed at present almost an irrelevancy. General Smuts says:

> 'To the ancient native life the traders dotted over Pondoland have proved a far more potent factor of change than the missionary with his ideal spiritual message of Christianity.'

If this be so, then the real missionary task is first with 'the trader,' that is, with us Europeans, and after that with the native. A Christian civilisation could have aided the native incalculably, saving his mind from magic and his body from disease and want. What he has encountered instead, outside the immediate sphere of the Mission or school, is a civilisation corrupted and decayed by leprous private enterprise for private profit. The native has looked for judgment, but behold, oppression, for righteousness, but behold, a cry. Under the circumstances photographed without comment in this book Christian preaching and teaching can be of little avail, and must surely strain the heart and conscience of the missionary to breaking-point. Social service, even medical service, in such a situation is but ambulance work. One might adapt the saying of Tolstoy and confess that the white man will do anything for the black man except get off his back. This book, factual, unimpassioned, imposes a missionary task not only upon priests and sisters, but also upon statesmen, educationalists, doctors, colonizers and men of business, that they and the native together may be saved, even now, body and soul. The time is overdue for missionary work of a kind and on a scale never yet attempted by the Christian Church.

M.T.D.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CATHOLIC, COMMUNIST, MODERNIST.

To the Editor of the *Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

I fancy that I am voicing the opinion of many of the younger members of the Modern Churchmen's Union, as well as others of progressive views. In your November issue you bitterly attack those in our Communion who call themselves Catholic, because of the vagaries of a few of their number.

Having been brought up in the Percy Dearmer tradition I have no love either for Tridentine theology or for Papal claims, but it is surely absurd to identify these extremists with a school of thought which has recently produced such a volume as *Anglicanism,* and which, through the fusion of Tractarian with Maurician thought, so profoundly influenced the social teaching of such men as Gore and Scott Holland, or a more home-spun prophet like the late Studdert-Kennedy.

It is true that there has never been a time when the Church has had such an opportunity and has so signally failed to utilise it, but we must not seek the cause of the present disastrous decay of religion in any failure to make modern thought acceptable, or in the habitual use of vestments or any other Catholic habit of worship. I think that this is proved by the fact that some of the most dearly loved and respected clergy in poor districts are such men as Father Groser. The reason why? Because he has identified himself with the poor and they feel that their cause is his.

The limitation of religion to a private union between the soul and its Maker, or the demand that religion should continue to give spiritual sanction to the existing order of things, cannot help this generation, which needs rebirth as a classless community. The apocalyptic element in the Gospels, the centrality of the Kingdom of God on earth in the teaching of the prophets and of Jesus, the condemnation of wealth and exploitation in

Church tradition, as well as the social experiment described in *Acts*, all evoke a response, while in a social instead of an individual context the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion take on a fresh significance.

As to the question of the form of public worship, it may be said that most of the workers, *i.e.* the vast majority of the populace, have little use for services of any kind and are not likely to be converted by any approximation to Cathedral standards. Yet a few would seem to appreciate a simple Sung Eucharist at which all make their communion, followed by breakfast and a discussion. We try to show them that the Communion is a foretaste of the true communion of all men in a blessed commonwealth, where all produce in common and share the fruits of their labour, and that the life of God is present in the consecrated community of mankind. But as the workers go out into the world they see only too clearly that the Communion is in actuality denied to men, and so they fight for better conditions and a true earthly commonwealth.

The Church, then, is a living organism composed of those who are dedicated to do God's will and to usher in His Kingdom. This task means strife and bitter suffering : it is summed up in the Cross, which comprehends all the self-offering for the common good in history. There can be no progress without conflict, and no immediate extension of community without a transference of power. Coercion is a correlative of sin, and we live sinfully, as Reinhold Niebuhr reminds us. For sin is the fact of isolation, the denial of community. We are under judgment, and the Church must prophesy or perish. But Dr. Inge tells us that the Church has neither mind nor voice. Presumably it is a mere body. If it is speechless and thoughtless it is but a parasite carcass that had better be scrapped, as the Marxists suggest.

We are to be members of a Church militant, not the church dilettante, nor a pleasant club of liberal idealists studying religious experience on unearned increment in a cathedral close, or minding their P.'s and Q.'s in college lecture-rooms. We need not be Papists to remember that Jesus founded His Church on a representative working-man. Yet it is not unknown to-day for so-called Christians to sniff at their clergy because, like their Master, they are not Honours Graduates of one of the older Universities and, like Him, speak with a good north-country accent.

When the Hunger Marchers came recently to London, as on one occasion a few men marched from Galilee to Jerusalem, among the multitude which met them I did not see the Modern Churchman in their ranks. But there were a few cassocks, greeted with cheers, of the obscurantists whom you tell us have frightened men away from the churches. It may be that Jesus has been frightened away from them too. If the Catholics have their unworthy Pharisees (and much Pharisaic zeal was worthy), Modernists have their Sadducees : both helped to kill Christ.

LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

24 Arundel Square, Barnsbury, N.7.

Nov. 21st, 1936.

[We have commented on this letter in our article, 'The English Parson.' —ED., *M.C.*]